REVIEW AND EVALUATION BULLETINS

Volume 3, Number 4
1982

The Training and Certification of Principals and Supervisory Officers in Ontario: A Perspective for the Future

Hon. Bette Stephenson, M.D., Minister
Harry K. Fisher, Deputy Minister

Ontario
Ministry of Education
Ministry of Colleges and Universities

The Training and Certification of Principals and Supervisory Officers in Ontario: A Perspective for the Future

Robert F. Thomas

This project reflects the views of the author and not necessarily those of the Ministries.

© The Minister of Education, Ontario, 1982
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data

Thomas, Robert F., 1926-
The training and certification of principals and supervisory officers in Ontario

(Review and evaluation bulletins, ISSN 0226-7306 ; v. 3, no. 4)

Co-published by Ministry of Colleges and Universities.
ISBN 0-7743-7778-X

1. School superintendents and principals--Training of--Ontario. 2. School supervisors--Training of--Ontario. I. Ontario. Ministry of Education. II. Ontario. Ministry of Colleges and Universities. III. Title. IV. Series.

LB2891.05T4 371.2'01'09713 82-0930091

ON02731

Additional copies may be ordered from:

Publications Sales
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
252 Bloor Street West
Toronto, Ontario
M5S 1V6

or from:

The Ontario Government Bookstore
880 Bay Street
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

(mail orders)
Publication Centre
880 Bay Street, 5th Floor
Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1N8

Contents Page

INTRODUCTION

A. Background 1
B. Issues 1
C. Recommendations 1

THE STUDY MANDATE AND METHODOLOGY 4

HISTORY

A. Courses Leading to Principal's Qualification 6
B. Supervisory Officer's Certification 8

THE ISSUES 10

RECOMMENDATIONS

RECOMMENDATION #1 22

RECOMMENDATION #2
2.1 Career Development Plan 22
2.2 Certification Process 26
2.2.1 Experience 26
2.2.2 Graduate Level Study 28
2.2.3 Certificate Courses 31

RECOMMENDATION #3
3.0 Certification Council Membership 32
3.1 Implementation of Recommendations 33
3.2 Legislation 34
3.3 Continuing eligibility 34
3.4 Acceptable courses 35
3.5 Certificate recognition 36
3.6 Transition legislation 36

CONCLUSION 38

APPENDICES

A. Opinion Survey re Certification and Training of Principals and Supervisory Officers 41
B. Programs Leading to Principal's Qualifications 47
C. Enrolment History, Principals' Courses, 1969-1982 50
D. Supervisory Officer's Certification Examination 51
--Candidate Numbers and Success Rates, 1973-82
--Examination Results, 1982

E. Opinion Survey re Certification and Training of Principals and Supervisory Officers..... 53
F. Questionnaire Analysis -- Responses by Client Group: Question A..... 59
G. Questionnaire Analysis -- Responses by Client Group: Question B..... 60
H. Questionnaire Analysis -- Responses by Client Group: Question C..... 62
I. Questionnaire Analysis -- Responses by Client Group: Question D..... 63
J. Questionnaire Analysis -- Responses by Client Group: Question E a)... 66
K. Questionnaire Analysis -- Responses by Client Group: Question E b)... 67
L. Questionnaire Analysis -- Responses by Client Group: Question E c)... 68
M. Consultations/Presentation re Training and Certification, 1980-1982... 69
N. Sources of Briefs and Recommendations Submitted..... 73

Introduction

A. BACKGROUND

The author's mandate is drawn from Recommendation 5.5.1 of Issues and Directions 1980 and from a memorandum of direction from the deputy minister, dated September 15, 1980.

Fulfilment of the mandate has been attempted through: extensive dialogue with educators across the province; participation in meetings of regional education councils, faculties of education, the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) and groups of school and school system administrators; membership on various committees associated with the certification of principals and supervisory officers; special meetings conducted in approximately 100 provincial locations; and formal and informal opinion surveys.

B. ISSUES

The major issues addressed include:

- the necessity for special certification of educational leadership personnel;
- the appropriateness of the provincial government as the certificating agency;
- identification of the appropriate agency for the design and administration of courses and/or examinations leading to certification;
- admission requirements for courses and/or examinations leading to certification;
- the control of content of certification programs;
- the definition of qualifications of eligibility for appointment to any specific leadership position.

C. RECOMMENDATIONS

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT:

1. PRESENT LEGISLATION REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORY OFFICERS BE REPEALED;

2. THERE BE ESTABLISHED IN LEGISLATION A SET OF REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION PREREQUISITE TO APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF RESPONSIBILITY BEYOND THAT OF CLASSROOM TEACHER IN AN ONTARIO SCHOOL OR SCHOOL SYSTEM; THESE REQUIREMENTS TO BE DEVELOPED IN THE CONTEXT OF A FIVE-STAGE CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN;

3. THERE BE ESTABLISHED IMMEDIATELY A CERTIFICATION COUNCIL WITH MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATIVE OF THOSE AGENCIES WITH A ROLE IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARATION OF PERSONS TO FILL POSITIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY BEYOND THAT OF CLASSROOM TEACHER IN THE SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF ONTARIO, THE COUNCIL'S MANDATE BEING TO EFFECT THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THIS REPORT. THE SEPARATE ELEMENTS OF THE MANDATE ARE:

3.1 to design and publicize a timeline for the full implementation of the recommended processes for the training and certification of personnel appointed to positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems;

3.2 to design appropriate legislation defining the requirements in:

basic formal education,
experience, and
special training

declared to be prerequisite to appointment to positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems;

3.3 to design appropriate legislation defining requirements for continuing eligibility for persons holding or eligible to hold positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems;

3.4 to identify and state clearly the criteria upon which acceptance can be granted for courses, programs and/or experience as components of the legislated prerequisites for appointment to positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems; such identification to include:

3.4.1 the core content of courses and programs;

3.4.2 the general nature and duration of acceptable experience;

3.4.3 the auspices under which courses can be delivered; and

3.4.4 the process for accreditation of courses and programs and for certification of acceptable experience;

3.5 to determine what recognition, if any, should be given by the Ministry of Education to personnel who meet the defined requirements for eligibility to appointment to a position of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems;

3.6 to design transition legislation to deal with:

3.6.1 the status of persons presently qualified (fully or partially) under existing legislation;

3.6.2 the means by which positions affected by the new legislation might be filled during the period between its initial implementation and the availability of adequate numbers of fully qualified persons to fill such positions.

The Study Mandate and Methodology

While the mandate given lies essentially in Recommendation 5.5.1 of Issues and Directions (1980), details were set out clearly in a memorandum from the deputy minister dated September 15, 1980, in which he advised the director of the Teacher Education Branch that:

"Dr. Thomas will report directly to me and will:

I. a) assess the present status of the programs that lead to the certification of principals and supervisory officers;

b) receive and criticize the relevant research addressing the programs in (a) and give particular emphasis to the ministry-sponsored research completed as part of the OAEAO's research program concerning supervisory officers;

c) review Recommendation 5.5.1 of Issues and Directions (1980), namely the advisability of the government, as a regulatory function, retaining control of the certification of supervisory officers and principals;

d) submit for consideration recommendations for the future development of the programs;

e) in the course of completing this assignment, consult with the staff of the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities and interested organizations in the education community, as follows:

Ontario Teachers' Federation
L'Association des surintendants franco-ontariens
Ontario Association of Education Administrative Officials
Ontario Catholic Supervisory Officers' Association
Ontario Secondary School Headmasters' Council
Ministry of Education
Ministry of Colleges and Universities
L'Association française des conseils scolaires d'Ontario
Northern Ontario Public and Secondary School Trustees' Association
Ontario Separate School Trustees' Association
Ontario Public School Trustees' Association
Elementary School Principals' Association

Further, as part of the research and consultative process, Dr. Thomas will attend meetings of regional councils, principals' groupings at the board level, faculties of education, and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education;

II. serve as a member of all standing committees relative to the planning of the courses for principals and those committees concerned with the certification of supervisory officers;

III. carry out particular assignments concerned with the professional development of principals and supervisory officers;

IV. carry out special assignments as required by the deputy minister."

In moving towards the fulfilment of this mandate, meetings have been conducted across the province in approximately 100 locations, where formal presentations have been made, informal dialogues conducted, and the opinions of some 3000 members of Ontario's educational community sought in an opinion survey (see Appendix A,). The focus of the presentations and discussions was on eight of the initiatives suggested in Issues and Directions that were felt to be relevant to the question of leadership of Ontario's schools. These initiatives precipitated a great deal of discussion and an impressively intense interest by the majority of those interviewed. This interest is manifest, at least partly, in the return of more than 2400 of the 3000 opinion surveys distributed. In addition to the discussions mentioned above and the opinion surveys returned, more than 140 statements from individuals or groups have been received. These statements vary from single-page letters to rather extensive briefs and address the issues perceived to be relevant to the question of leadership training in the province.

The initiatives from Issues and Directions, which were used as a basis for presentations and on most of which opinions were sought in the opinion survey, are:

3.9.1 The Ministry of Education...will establish a Crown Agency which...will...assist in the placement overseas of Ontario educators.

4.3.1 The...Ministry of Education...will plan the creation of a professional association or "College of Teachers", which will exercise...rights of admission, certification, discipline, professional development. ...

4.6.2 The ministry proposes...to encourage school boards to adopt five-year term contracts for all positions of responsibility.

5.4.2 It is proposed that trustees, board officials, and the Ontario Teachers' Federation be asked to join...in discussing...methods for...assessment of the performance of individual teachers and officials.

5.5.1 The Ministry of Education proposes to review the advisability of retaining control of the certification of supervisory officers and principals.

5.5.2 The Ministry of Education proposes to examine the feasibility...of making school boards directly responsible for ensuring the effective discharge of assigned duties by supervisory officers and principals.

5.8.1 ...Every school board should review concurrently all phases of its operation...at least once in a ten-year period. ...

5.13.1 It is proposed that the ministry enter into immediate discussion...towards the formation of a single trustees' organization.

History

A study of this sort must be undertaken in the context of a history of the processes under review. The statements below include the history of courses leading to principal's qualifications as extracted from ministry files and a brief summary from W.C. VanderBurgh's History of the School Inspector in Ontario.

Three of the appendices relate to this history. Appendix B gives in summary the statements indicating the progression of titles and scope of qualifications from 1951 to the present. Appendix C gives the enrolment figures from 1969.

Appendix D gives data regarding the Supervisory Officer's Certification Examination, with summary figures from 1973 to 1982 and some specific details regarding the 1982 examination.

A. COURSES LEADING TO PRINCIPAL'S QUALIFICATIONS

Qualifications

These courses began with a single summer program in 1951 that led to a High School Principal's Certificate. A Vocational School Principals' Course leading to a Vocational School Principal's Certificate had been conducted for a number of years, and agreement was reached to alternate the High School Principals' Course and the Vocational School Principals' Course in successive summers.

This format continued until it was replaced in 1957 by a revised program that required two consecutive summers of study leading to the Secondary School Principal's Certificate, which was a permanent certificate for persons holding positions as principal or vice-principal of secondary schools and was an interim certificate for others until they attained one of these positions. The first summer was oriented towards leadership in the academic secondary school and the second emphasized principalship in the vocational school.

The next major change took place in 1966, when successful experience became an additional requirement for the attainment of an Interim Secondary School Principal's Certificate, Type B, which could be made permanent after a minimum of two years' successful experience as a vice-principal in a secondary school, as a principal of a secondary school having fewer than 500 students, or as a principal of a special vocational school. A Permanent Certificate, Type B became a prerequisite for entrance to the second session, leading to the Secondary School Principal's Certificate, Type A.

A further requirement for permanent certification was added in 1969. In addition to the experience element, two graduate units in education from a recognized university became a requirement for a Permanent Certificate, Type B. The Type A required a total of four units.

The first provincially-sponsored course leading to an Interim Elementary School Principal's Certificate was offered in 1966. This was a one-summer program that dealt with the role of the principal in an elementary school. In 1970 it was integraced with the first session for secondary candidates.

This integrated course evolved into a design in which content was organized around leadership. Elements included in the program were: training for human effectiveness, educational philosophies and program development, the principal at his practice, and trends and innovations.

The principals' course continued to respond to changing demands. In 1971, the second session of the secondary course embarked on a tutorial approach that would allow candidates to pursue a wide diversity of interests in a comprehensive manner. These individual and small group studies were guided by tutors and shared with fellow students in seminar settings.

By 1977, nine common program elements were identified for inclusion in the courses:

-- Leadership
-- School Law
-- Curriculum
-- Issues in Education
-- Evaluation
-- Administration
-- Interest Groups
-- Research
-- Philosophy of Education

In 1978, candidates in the second session of the secondary course were assigned to courses held in London and Kingston. They took part of the program with the other candidates and part as a separate group. In addition, in the summer of 1978, a course was established in Sudbury for French-language candidates only.

Although Ontario Regulation 407/78 came into force on July 1, 1978, candidates who successfully completed the first session that summer were given either an Interim Elementary School Principal's Certificate or an Interim Secondary School Principal's Certificate, Type B. Candidates who successfully completed the second session were given endorsement on their Ontario Teacher's Qualifications Record Card for "program supervision and assessment". The form used on the record card is PRIN. S & A.

In 1979, the transition to the new certification regulation qualifications was completed, courses were offered in both program development and implementation and program supervision and assessment at six centres for English speaking candidates and at one centre for French speaking candidates. Candidates completing successfully the two sessions were thereby qualified to serve as vice-principals and principals in any school, kindergarten to grade thirteen.

In 1980, approval was given for establishing courses on an experimental basis. Parts I and II were offered in North York under the supervision of an advisory body of administrative personnel from fifteen boards in and around Metropolitan Toronto, for candidates from the fifteen boards. Admission to Part I was open to all eligible candidates, with the result that over 1200 registered.

Open admission was granted to Part I across the province in the summer of 1982. Again, over 1200 candidates registered in Part I, with approximately 400 in Part II.

The experimental course, Part II only, was continued in North York for candidates who had completed Part I in the winter 1980-81 session. Approximately 900 candidates have completed that course.

Current plans include offering courses in the summer of 1982 in eleven locations:

-- Hamilton
-- Kingston
-- London
-- North Bay
-- Ottawa
-- Peterborough
-- St. Catharines
-- Sudbury (French language)
-- Thunder Bay
-- Toronto
-- Waterloo

Registration of a total of 1974 candidates has been completed. A budget was established to support courses for about 1500 candidates.

The excessively large number has led to a special agreement with personnel at York University, whereby approximately 500 candidates will be accommodated there, and Parts I and II will be offered under the sponsorship of the university.

B. SUPERVISORY OFFICER'S CERTIFICATION

In 1871, with the creation of the office of county inspector, the first provincial examinations were set for prospective supervisory officials. Through the succeeding century both the role of such persons and the qualifications required have undergone an evolution. The focal point of the work of those appointed out of the teaching profession has always been the improvement of instruction, but with the growth of large school systems, especially since 1969, administrative demands on those employed by the systems have increased greatly. The numbers of such people employed by the provincial government have also been considerably reduced -- reflecting the government's continuing policy of decentralization of services.

For many years now, the certification of supervisory officials has been based on two examinations: the long-standing, three-hour written examination, and an oral examination conducted by a panel of Ministry of Education officials. The substance of both examinations has been as set out in Ontario Regulation 276/82:

S.2(3) The examinations referred to in subsection 1 shall be held at times and places as the minister determines and shall be based on:

(a) the Acts administered by the minister and the regulations thereunder;

(b) the curriculum guidelines and other reference material pertaining to elementary and secondary education in Ontario; and

(c) theories and practices of supervision, administration, and business organization that may be applicable to the effective operation of a school system.

In 1975, legislation was enacted that made it possible for personnel whose employment in educational systems (provincial and municipal) was in the business departments to acquire by examination the supervisory officer certification. Slight modifications in the examination were made to recognize the business orientation of these personnel, but the qualifications for admission to the examination closely paralleled those of candidates from the academic field. (One notable exception, of course, was the requirement for a teaching certificate. It should be noted, too, that supervisory positions at the chief executive officer level were not available to anyone lacking an Ontario teaching certificate.)

In 1982, for the first time in Ontario's history, men and women from both municipal jurisdictions and the faculties of education became involved in preparing and administrating of both the oral and written examinations. Committees of representatives working with ministry officials were, in fact, very active and had full membership on the oral examination panels. This innovation has been strongly endorsed by the participants and their colleagues.

Appendix D summarizes the numbers of candidates and the success rates for the certification examinations since 1973 and presents additional data regarding the 1982 examination. In 1982, 257 candidates wrote the examination and an additional 36 registered to attempt the oral, having completed successfully an earlier written examination (in 1981 or before).

It can be seen that the rate of success in the 1982 examination was low, particularly in the written examination. Appendix D sets out some interesting data relative to the examination. Seventy appeals were received for re-examination of the written papers. Five of these appeals were upheld, bringing the total number of officers granted certificates in 1982 to 74.

The Issues

Considered in light of both the history of educational leadership in Ontario and the increasing complexity of the leadership role universally, the scope of this study might seem to be almost limitless. It is patently obvious that no one individual or group can address adequately all relevant issues in the time given. In recognition of this fact and the application of a degree of realism, this study has attempted to address one set of issues on which the recommendations focus and which are set forth here in the form of a series of questions. The author's ultimate answers to the questions lie in the recommendations made.

Question 1 *Is the provincial government's present form of certification of personnel occupying leadership positions in Ontario's schools and school systems appropriate to current educational needs?*

Throughout the world, there appears to be no other jurisdiction where the certification of educational leadership personnel is defined and administered at the senior level of government. To be unique is not of itself to be inappropriate. The pattern in jurisdictions studied by this author, however, suggests that the involvement of personnel more directly associated with the school systems than senior government officials can possibly be gives an assurance that certification demands are relevant to role-performance demands, which otherwise would be highly unlikely.

In Ontario, recent practice has been to have staff members of the central offices create legislation governing admission requirements and course outlines for courses leading to principal's qualifications. These men and women, while impeccably qualified for service in many areas, have had no recent experience--and in many cases no experience at all -- in positions resembling those for which the courses are intended to qualify candidates. This is not to denigrate in any way the professional competence or integrity of these individuals but simply to indicate that their experience and training qualify them far better for other tasks.

Much has been written to elaborate on the extensive changes that have taken place in the past few years in the roles of educational leaders. Hay (1980) writes variously of "dramatic changes", "competence in skills of human relations and political awareness", and "the need for principals to have legal awareness", to illustrate characteristics of a role that originally demanded first the skills of a highly competent teacher.

In addressing the impact of the "new regionalism" in Ontario education, Fisher (1972) acknowledges the desire for sovereignty on the part of school boards. Certainly the success or failure of the entire system in Ontario will depend in very large measure on the extent to which leadership personnel are trained to meet the new circumstances. To leave the training design in the control of only one agency is clearly to limit the direction such training will likely take.

In the past, the numbers of candidates for principal's qualifications were controlled by the province. Quotas were established in relation to system needs. This pattern effected a limit in the number of candidates, which meant that the majority had reasonable assurance of imminent appointment to leadership positions. The removal of the control in 1980 has resulted in an influx of candidates numbering in the thousands--and with a very wide range of training, experience, interests, and potential for leadership. It has been necessary to establish larger courses in more centres and to place different emphases on certain elements of the courses. Local interests have been more dominant as the range of geographical areas represented by candidates has narrowed.

There has been, of course, a need for much larger numbers of staff to give course leadership. The problem of finding increased numbers of staff has been compounded by the diminishing numbers of provincially-employed personnel, hence reducing greatly the proportion of ministry persons on the staffs of courses.

The number of candidates for certification as supervisory officers has not been controlled by design. The number of men and women eligible for appointment to positions requiring that certification has been seen by some, however, to be insufficient.

Although a detailed analysis has not been made it can be stated definitely that the number of candidates eligible for appointment to positions of vice-principal and principal is currently very high in proportion to the number of candidates eligible for appointment to positions designated as supervisory officer. This situation is a manifestation of a number of conditions that will be addressed in other parts of this report. The critical issue with regard to numbers, however, remains. Is the present process of certification giving school systems adequately prepared leaders in the required numbers? Consultation with many senior leadership personnel, particularly in large school boards, suggests not.

The author's meetings with personnel throughout the province, the data amassed in the opinion survey (see Appendices E-L), and the briefs received (sources are listed in Appendix N) have made clear certain positions relative to the question of central certification. Appendix E summarizes the opinions of respondents as a group. Subsequent appendices indicate the responses by individual client groups.

It should be noted that the term "College of Teachers" is used to denote the acceptability of the role of such a body, were it to be created. The author's presentations included references to the possible creation of such a body--loosely defined but clearly intended to be interpreted here as indicated on the survey form.

Table 1 gives the summary data on the question of who should be responsible for certification. Obviously, the Ministry of Education is seen as the most highly acceptable agency, but in the great majority of responses it was seen to be acceptable in co-operation with one or more other agencies, chief among them the hypothetical College of Teachers.

Table 1. Agencies Perceived To Be Appropriate for Certification of Principals and Supervisory Officers*.

	Pr's.		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) None is needed	1.6	1.3	2.1	4.1
b) Ministry of Education	61.0	59.7	64.5	53.5
c)** Ministry of Colleges and Universities	7.6	7.2	8.3	7.7
d) Professional organization(s)	22.3	21.5	17.7	25.0
e) Faculties of education	11.4	11.4	8.8	5.6
f)***College of Teachers	39.4	38.1	27.7	17.8

* From Question A in opinion survey (see Appendix E).

** MCU identified in presentations as the Teacher Education Branch then responsible for administration of certification processes

*** As proposed in Issues and Directions the College of Teachers is seen as a professional licensing body for all members of the profession.

An examination of Appendix F reveals that there was generally a fairly high degree of unanimity among the client groups regarding certificating bodies for each of the four positions considered--particularly with regard to the two ministries. The significant aspect of the responses, supported in the positions expressed in most other forums, is that there is strong feeling that the central government should retain a significant role in the certification process, though not in the precise manner in which it is now involved.

Recent years have seen a vast increase in the amount of time given to research and writing regarding the leadership role in education. One bibliography of titles pertaining to the principal's role, for example, cites 120 titles dealing with a range of concerns including budget, conflict resolution, evaluation, litigation, politics, and stress. Several hundred more titles can be found with more intensive subject-identification. The fact is simply that the role of leader, in education as elsewhere, has become increasingly complex, much more sophisticated, and is being performed in a milieu vastly different from that of just a few years ago.

Present legislation for admission to courses leading to principal's qualifications does not require exposure to any of the research or to any relevant study at the graduate level. This in itself contradicts to some extent the value of education. Two courses of 125

hours each cannot possibly provide such exposure and provide simultaneously the practical kinds of training needed for school administration and for program development.

The certification process for supervisory officers is a blatant anomaly. Originally established to grant certificates to men and women who would go into the schools as servants of the provincial government, to assess the performance of elementary school classroom teachers and inspire improvement therein, the process was designed and administered by persons who had experienced the role and would, in fact, be supervising the performance of successful candidates. In 1982, however, supervisory officers have very little hope of serving under the provincial government, may serve elementary and/or secondary schools, business or academic interests and, indeed, have minimal contact on a regular basis with classroom teachers--or, for that matter with the schools themselves.

In 1981 the examination process was conducted entirely by persons whose professional experience and training are oriented to a specific discipline or division and/or to the training of teachers. None had served as principal or supervisory officer in an Ontario school jruisdiction in at least fifteen years--if at all. What they have to offer the examination process is vital but does not guarantee an understanding of the vast range of role demands that characterize leadership positions in school systems.

Certain other aspects of present legislation pertaining to certification for the leadership roles in question should be noted at this juncture.

No specific mention is made of a Bachelor of Arts degree for admission to courses leading to principal's qualifications. This has been interpreted by some to mean eligibility for certain technical teachers otherwise qualified. Since the ministry's interpretation is that a candidate must have a Bachelor's degree, it should be stated.

The requirement of a concentration in three divisions is intended to guarantee some degree of cross-panel understanding, in light of the fact that holding the present principal's qualifications makes one eligible to serve as principal in either panel. Actually, the "concentration" is minimal -- it does not have an experience requirement and has been to date a discriminatory requirement, since elementary trained candidates have the three-division concentration through basic training while secondary candidates have not. (The situation will admittedly change in another year as elementary candidates trained after 1978 become eligible for the courses.) The requirement's intention was completely negated during the program's first three years, when one could substitute three additional years experience in one division.

To equate a Specialist Certificate to a Master's or Doctoral degree for purposes of admission to the courses is to denigrate graduate study in the extreme. The requirements for the certificate are very much oriented to a specific discipline and, hence, largely content-laden. While they need not by definition, the latter degrees most often reflect graduate study in an area or areas relating more to the requirements of educational leadership. The total study and time requirements for the two can differ by a great many graduate school credits.

Requirements for admission to the Supervisory Officer Certification Examinations do not require either graduate level study or experience beyond the classroom level. Technically, one can assume the position of director of education of any school system in the province on completion of seven years' successful teaching experience anywhere.

Since candidates for principal's qualifications require at least five years' teaching experience in Ontario and a concentration in three divisions, it can be seen that many men and women qualified as supervisory officers in Ontario are not qualified to become certificated as principals. This seems a strange paradox, indeed, since provincial legislation indicates that a supervisory officer, on entering a school in his/her jurisdiction can assume all the responsibilities of the principal. He/she is qualified to usurp a position that he/she is not qualified to hold!

The simple answer to the question is "no". It is apparent, however, that removing responsibility from the provincial government is not an acceptable answer to government or client groups. A change, nonetheless, is clearly warranted.

Question 2 *What agency or agencies ought to assume responsibility for defining the certification requirements for personnel occupying leadership positions in Ontario's schools and school systems?*

The provincial government, through both the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Colleges and Universities, has a role to play.

Although the Ministry of Education is essentially a policy-making body rather than a service-delivery agent as well as an arm of a government committed to a general policy of decentralization, it does design the legislative framework within which the province's schools function and, indeed, provides a substantial amount of the financial resources that fund the schools. Hence the ministry can be perceived to have a responsibility to determine who will qualify to provide leadership at the school and system level.

There is, however, a partnership operating to meet the needs of the province's young people. The school systems have a very clear responsibility to meet the needs of their respective jurisidictions by adapting provincial aims to local needs. It is thus of considerable importance that those who serve at the local level, and who meet the schools' requirements in a very practical sense, have a measure of control in the preparation of leadership personnel. Representation at the local level has two discrete elements: the professional (practitioner) and the client (through the elected body of trustees and/or directly from the electorate served).

The delivery of training programs is principally in the hands of the faculties of education and OISE. These bodies are designed, equipped, and staffed to convey the substance of theory and research and are the most effective agencies for education at the adult level.

It must be recognized that theory alone cannot effect the best decision-making. It must also be recognized that actions planned solely on practical experience leave too much to chance. Hence training programs designed on the basis of theory alone may very well lack the critical element of reality, while programs designed exclusively by practitioners will be limited to the experiences of the individual practitioners responsible. The two are complementary.

To ignore the value of the offerings of the academic community is to challenge the validity of the educational enterprise. If we who are part of it, committed to the development of the human intellect as we are, do not value its inclusion in our own

development, we surely render questionable, if not virtually meaningless, the profession that sustains us.

The author has found that most respondents to the survey indicate strong support for continued central control, in some manner, of the requirements for appointees to positions of responsibility. This attitude in some ways manifests what is seen as almost a mystique associated with the process.

There is little rational support for continuing the present certification process when one considers the dissatisfaction many expressed concerning the framework for the courses leading to principal's qualifications, the examination process for supervisory officer certification, and, most particularly, certain inconsistencies, weaknesses, and unreasonable demands perceived to be implicit in the present legislation regarding prerequisites for admission to the processes associated with certification.

There can be seen, too, a grave inconsistency in the continued demand for sponsorship by the provincial government of qualification processes that effect a very real financial demand in school systems. (Reference here is to the salary implications for successful candidates who acquire the relevant certification--surely a conflict for the body that both offers financial support and effects expenditure controls.)

Certification of leadership personnel, then, must be the product of the combined forces of the ministry(ies), the faculties of education (including OISE), and the personnel in the school systems. The professional force, trained as it is to meet educational needs, gives the practical perspective of active service and, hence, ought to serve as the major body in the design. The academic community can best apply the wisdom of research and study. The forces of government must be represented to guarantee the accountability to which the public is legitimately entitled.

The importance of involving school system personnel, must be made very clear. Reference here is to the men and women engaged directly in service to the schools and school systems and to the large number of organizations through which they have province-wide representation. Organizations of teachers, administrators, senior officials, and trustees have given excellent service to their membership through a succession of workshops, courses, seminars, and conferences. All these activities have been designed to meet recognized needs of the various memberships. Having proven their skills in recognizing and meeting needs, such organizations have very clearly a legitimate voice in defining the training processes. They constitute a critical part of the strong force working to serve the province's educational needs.

Table 2 summarizes respondents answers to the author's opinion survey on this question. It can be seen that the Ministry of Education is perceived to be the most appropriate agency, but again, responses generally indicate that it should function in co-operation with one or more other agencies. Again, the hypothetical College of Teachers gained high recognition as an agent to be involved in defining requirements for the training of school principals. The professional organizations ran a very close third. For supervisory officers, the professional organizations were the most favoured after the Ministry of Education.

Table 2. Agencies That Ought to Define Training Requirements*

LEGISLATED TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Given that a prescribed training program is desirable, who should "write the prescription" for principals and supervisory officers (i.e., what agency should determine what training program is necessary)?

	Pr's.		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) The aspirant to the position	9.9	9.5	7.9	6.6
b) The Ministry of Education	62.8	61.2	65.0	51.9
c) The College of teachers	38.5	37.9	28.2	16.7
d) The employing body	22.4	21.1	21.6	26.0
e) Faculties of education	12.6	12.5	10.4	6.5
f) Professional associations (federations, OAEOA*, **etc.)	37.0	35.6	34.1	30.4

* From Question C in opinion survey (See Appendix E).

** i.e., the provincial association of supervisory officers.

Appendix H analyses responses to this question by client groups. It can be seen that fewer than ten per cent support removing the definition of training requirements. A majority of respondents with teaching backgrounds supports the definition by the ministry for all positions, except that of business supervisory officer. Again, however, it is clear that strong support is given to the concept of a co-operatively-developed definition. Faculties of education, however, rank a low fifth as a favoured agency by all respondents, whereas many (in excess of 30 per cent) respondents perceive the professional organizations as appropriate contributors.

Question 3 *Given the definition of a set of requirements for the certification of personnel occupying positions of leadership in Ontario's schools and school systems, what agency or agencies ought to provide specific programs, if such are demanded, via which the requirements can be fulfilled?*

The design and administration of whatever processes are required of educational leaders should be ultimately the responsibility of the profession itself, with the support of the central governing body and the academic community. The author has perceived throughout the province a reluctance to approve the transfer of full responsibility for present course requirements to the academic community, even though the faculties of education now administer all other certification courses. In the author's view, this attitude is difficult to rationalize.

First, there is every indication that certificates now issued through faculty-administered courses reflect programs of substance and relevance. Second, the faculties have consistently used many practising educators from school systems as instructors, so that courses can and do reflect classroom realities, thus tempering the "ivory tower" theories feared by so many. As long as the reluctance to support the transfer to the faculties remains, however, it would seem to be in the best interests of education to establish a means by which the ministry can be perceived to remain in control at the same time as both practical relevance and academic integrity are ensured.

Until 1980, all courses leading to recognized certification of principals were the responsibility of the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Colleges and Universities. Unofficially, in the sense of certificate recognition, courses of various kinds have been offered with great success by the Ontario Teachers' Federation and each of its affiliates, by several organizations of supervisory officials--both academic and business, and by the Ontario Council for Leadership in Education (OCLEA). Praise for the quality and relevance of such courses has been consistently high, and, in many instances, pleas have been made for provincial recognition. Thomas (1976) disclosed in his review of professional development of area superintendents that OCLEA courses had been by far the most valuable to them vis a vis service as supervisory officers.

In recent years, increasing value has been found in programs offered by some commercial agencies. Organizations established by former members of public education staffs have proven well able to offer excellent professional development opportunities for personnel at all levels of school system.

There are, then, many agencies perceived to be capable of providing effective leadership training. The significant factors are undoubtedly the substance of such programs and the strengths of the personnel providing leadership. From the point of view of both its recent staffing practices and the government's policy of decentralization, the Ministry of Education is the least appropriate body to offer training courses.

Question 4 *What precise definition should be given to prerequisites for admission to programs leading to certification for appointment to positions of educational leadership and to what extent should course content by defined?*

The two aspects of this question are closely related to course content, which is obviously definable only on the basis of a clear statement of the prerequisites that can be assumed to have been met by all candidates to the programs. As suggested earlier, at present the precision in the legislation governing requirements for admission to the certification processes is very difficult to support. Care has gone into preparing the legislation, but it would appear that the definition has become an end in itself, which precludes flexibility. Also, certain elements of the legislation are inconsistent, and it is the author's deep conviction that the legislation no longer serves the needs of education but is, in fact, a restricting and nearly self-serving anomaly.

Present legislation for both levels of certification is such that candidates can move to any of these positions of responsibility without ever having undertaken any study beyond basic teacher training in any of the areas critically relevant to leadership in education. Such areas are:

-- Administration	-- Child Development	-- Curriculum Development
-- Educational Finance	-- Educational Politics	-- Evaluation
-- Leadership	-- Learning Theories	-- Legislation
-- Management	-- Organizational Behaviour	-- Special Education

A further paradox now exists in giving non-teaching personnel access to a certification process founded entirely in a tradition of classroom supervision. With one modification in the examination format, we have come to expect men and women from the business community to undergo exactly the same process as those who traditionally aspired to the role of school inspector. The positions warrant a more relevant screening process.

The content of whatever programs are demanded of leadership personnel can be defined best by the combined strengths of representatives of the legislating body, the practitioners, and the academic community, and program content must be designed to meet clearly articulated goals based on clearly articulated prerequisites of learning and experience. It is not the opinion of this author, however, that there can be for all educational leaders a "preparation panacea" in the form of a single training program or experience pattern. Individual differences are no less characteristic of leadership personnel than of any other group, and effective leadership must surely depend for its success--to some degree at least--on the unique qualities of the individual in the role and the extent to which these qualities are developed.

The present certification process for supervisory officers cannot be considered a training process. Legislation pertaining to the examination, however, implies that measure should be taken of candidates' familiarity with the legislation, understanding of the curriculum guidelines and relevant reference material, and understanding of theory and practice pertaining to supervision, administration, and business organization as is appropriate for the effective operation of a school system--all this in a three-hour written examination plus thirty minutes (or less) in an oral examination!

Enough has been said here about the certification process and its historical context. In the past the process was probably quite appropriate. Today, however, it attempts the impossible, without guidelines, objectives, or procedures laid down anywhere. The tradition is no longer adequate, particularly in light of the fact that critical decisions are made by many whose training and experience are vastly different from those whose measure they take.

An interesting statistic from the 1982 examination suggests the need for clarifying the objectives of the process and examining critically the process itself. Directors of education were asked to provide a statement of their perceptions of candidates' readiness for certification as supervisory officers. Of the sixty-eight successful candidates whose directors wrote statements, sixteen (24%) were said by employers to be not ready for certification. That is, there are sixteen educators in Ontario, newly qualified to serve as supervisory officers, whose performance in their present roles has been deemed by observers to lack promise for potential senior leadership while the Ministry of Education has been interpreted as saying they are ready.

As further evidence of the impressive disparity between the evaluation standards of employers and examiners, one could point out that 141 candidates who failed to complete the examination requirements were said by their directors to be ready for certification. Whether such statistics legitimately challenge one or the other measurement procedure (examination or performance evaluation), they clearly challenge the total process if the two can be presumed compatible. If, in fact, the two measures are valid yet different, then the criteria for assessment, the processes used, and the objectives each is expected to achieve should be clearly articulated for all concerned. At this time, only the legislation referred to has been set down in print.

Precedents exist for articulating the requirements for relevant study that are prerequisite to completing certification requirements for both principals and supervisory officers. Although the requirements may have made minimal demands, they at least recognized the value of graduate-level study as contributing to the development of educational leaders.

In 1969, two graduate units in education from a recognized university became a requirement for a Permanent Principal's Certificate, Type B and an additional two units for its Type A counterpart. This was a short-lived requirement for secondary school certification.

For a period of time from 1947, admission requirements to what was then the Public School Inspector's Certificate included "four units in pedagogy" (unless one "had been honourably discharged from His Majesty's Forces").

In both instances mentioned above there were certain acceptable alternatives, but for the great majority of candidates, exposure to graduate-level study was not an alternative.

The opinion survey sought respondents' opinions and views regarding experience and training requirements. Table 3 summarizes their responses.

Table 3. Perceived Pre-Appointment Requirements in Experience and Training*

PRE-APPOINTMENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: What should be required? (check one or more)	Pr.'s		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) Teaching certificate	80.5	77.1	71.5	29.6
b) Less than 5 years' successful teaching experience (Ont.)	1.9	1.5	1.0	3.8**
c) At least 5 years' successful teaching experience (Ont.)	57.1	53.4	39.0	23.0**
d) At least 7 years' successful teaching experience (Ont.)	20.3	20.1	18.1	8.5**
e) More than 7 years' successful teaching experience (Ont.)	14.7	15.2	23.3	10.6**
f) Graduate degree-- Masters level	51.8	54.4	59.4	40.2
g) Graduate degree-- Doctorate level	0.7	1.0	6.6	2.7
h) Internship experience-- three months	6.0	5.4	4.6	4.0
i) Internship experience-- six months	6.1	6.2	6.0	5.3
j) Internship experience-- one year	30.3	29.6	27.8	22.5
k) Internship experience-- more than one year	7.1	7.3	8.8	9.3
l) Experience in position of responsibility at level below principal	47.6	52.8	33.2	-
m) Experience as principal	-	-	59.3	-

* From Question B in opinion survey see Appendix E.

** On instruction, teaching experience was read as relevant business experience for responses to items b through e in column 4.

An examination of Appendix G discloses the respondents' opinions by client group.

It is clear that a teaching background is considered an important prerequisite for appointees to the position of principal, but much less so for academic supervisory officers--even though a teaching certificate and experience as principal are perceived by a majority to be important. What appears to be an inconsistency here may be the by-product of unclear questioning. It may also be an expression of the respondents' opinion that the experience component demanded of principals is implicit in the question regarding supervisory officers. Interpretation of the question could be, then, that more teaching experience would be demanded of a supervisory officer beyond that required of a principal. In any event, it is evident to the author that a large majority of members of the profession serving in in-school positions demand teaching qualifications for all academic supervisory officers, including chief executive officers.

The precision applied, then, to defining the requirements in training and experience prerequisite to appointment to positions of added responsibility is not the real issue. Identifying the wide range of training opportunities relevant to role performance is required, as is a means by which accomplishment of such opportunities can be recognized.

The author has discussed at some length, with representatives of five of the faculties of education and of OISE the feasibility of such identification. It seems quite evident that a great many courses highly relevant to the needs of aspiring school leaders are now being offered. There is a clear indication, too, that personnel in the faculties are prepared to co-operate in designing additional courses where further needs can be identified.

As indicated earlier, many professional organizations and commercial agencies also have made available a wide range of professional development opportunities. These have been praised widely as having been of great value to the participants. It would seem unreasonable not to provide for recognition of the accomplishment of such courses, which can be seen to make a genuine contribution to the professional development of aspiring and/or practising leaders in education, regardless of the sponsoring agency.

Recommendations

1. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT PRESENT LEGISLATION REGARDING CERTIFICATION OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORY OFFICERS BE REPEALED.

This recommendation is designed simply to extract from the Education Act those parts of regulations that set out the requirements for admission to the certification processes under review and the related qualification requirements. These regulations and relevant sections are:

A. Regulation 262

Elementary and Secondary Schools and Schools for Trainable Retarded Pupils--General

S.10 (1) (a) (b)
S.11 (1) (a)

B. Regulation 269

Ontario Teacher's Qualifications

S.39-(1) (2)
40-(a) (b) (c) (d)
41 to 48 (inc.)

C. Regulation 276

Supervisory Officers
Part I
Qualifications of a Supervisory Officer

2. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THERE BE ESTABLISHED IN LEGISLATION A SET OF REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATION PREREQUISITE TO APPOINTMENT TO A POSITION OF RESPONSIBILITY BEYOND THAT OF CLASSROOM TEACHER IN AN ONTARIO SCHOOL OR SCHOOL SYSTEM; THESE REQUIREMENTS TO BE DEVELOPED IN THE CONTEXT OF A FIVE-STAGE CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN.

2.1 CAREER DEVELOPMENT PLAN

In view of the widespread feeling perceived by the author that Ontario should preserve its present unique position (i.e., having central certification of qualifications for leadership positions), an attempt has been made to reconcile the feeling with associated realities.

Both the relevant literature and reports of practical experience stress the complexity of role demands in today's school systems. Members of the ministry's staff most recently responsible for its certification processes, however, are far removed from school system leadership as it is now performed. To leave the preparation of leadership personnel in their hands is to ignore the need for the depth of understanding of the role(s), which can be gained only in practice.

On the other hand, Ontario schools operate within a framework of provincial legislation, and the majority of those serving in the school systems have expressed a strong need for central control of some sort. Hence while provincial involvement in preparing leadership personnel must continue, the training process must relate much more strongly to actual performance requirements than it does at present.

The recommendation recognizes a continuity in the leadership role from the lowest to highest level. The five stages suggested are represented in Table 4.

Table 4.

STAGE	POSITION	PREREQUISITES	
ONE	Teacher	1. Bachelor's degree	- and -
		2. Basic teaching certificate	
TWO	(a) Chairman	1. Bachelor's degree	- and -
	Dept. Head	2. Basic teaching certificate	- and -
		3. Five year's successful teaching experience in at least two divisions (minimum of 1 year in a division)	- and -
		4. One of:	
		(i) specialist certification	OR
		(ii) four approved graduate courses in Education	- and -
		5. An approved course in basic skills of leadership in education	
	(b) Vice-Principal	1-5 above	- and -
		6. An approved course in advanced skills of leadership in education	

Table 4. (cont'd)

STAGE	POSITION	PREREQUISITES
THREE	Consultant Principal	1-6 Above - and - 7. Four approved graduate courses in education - and - 8. At least one year of proven educational leadership as certified by principal or supervisory officer - and - 9. An approved course in either: (i) program and administrative leadership in elementary education OR (ii) program and administrative leadership in secondary education
FOUR	Supervisory Officer	1. One of: (i) 1 - 9 above OR (ii) experience and training deemed *equivalent to 1--9 as appropriate to the area of responsibility for which supervisory officer status is sought - and - 2. At least three year's successful experience as principal or program consultant for a school system, or in a position deemed equivalent by an official in authority over the candidate 3. An approved course in Program and Administrative Leadership in Elementary or Secondary Education not taken before. 4. Two approved graduate courses in education. - and - 5. An approved course in senior management in education.
FIVE	Chief Executive Officer	1. Qualification as a Supervisory Officer as set out in STAGE FOUR above. - and - 2. At least three year's successful experience as a Supervisory Officer in a school system. - and - 3. Two approved graduate courses in education - and - 4. An approved course in senior management in education.

* The equivalence is to be determined by a certification council established for the purpose.

1. STAGE ONE--the first level of professional performance.
For educators this would be the level of classroom teacher. For personnel in educational services that do not require a teaching certificate (e.g., psychological services, social work, research), it would be the first level of service requiring professional qualifications. For personnel in business-related service, it would be in any of the host of positions requiring a form of specialized training but with minimal supervisory responsibilities.

It is the author's intention that service within a school system--stages one to three--need not be a requirement for the latter two groups mentioned above. In fact, broader, more effective service would be seen as a by-product of men and women entering into school system leadership with varying backgrounds of experience in a range of environments.

2. STAGE TWO--the first level of added responsibility.
The major characteristic unique to this career position would be the assumption of some responsibility for the performance of one or more other adults. Such responsibility could be in the form of supervising small groups within the same branch, department, or division, or it might be in some aspect of performance evaluation. The two significant aspects are that there be some demand for a leadership role with other adults and that the role be performed at the school, branch, or department level, rather than at a broader system level. In the school systems, performance is typical of that required of staff in such positions as subject chairman or department head.

In some respects a vice-principal is perceived to be at this level, although there is no suggestion that existing line relationships in school staffs should change. To reinforce this position an additional course requirement for vice-principals is recommended. Such a course would necessarily include some elements of practical administration.

Non-teachers would be seen to acquire experience at this level in positions demanding that some kind of influence be made on other adults in the fulfilment of their responsibilities. Business personnel, for example, might have supervisory reponsibilities for other staff in a major branch of a large system, though they would not be seen to be involved extensively in policy-making matters. Psychology-staff members who were seen to perform at this level would have some responsibility for guiding teacher behaviour vis à vis a student on whose behalf psychological assessment has been made.

Typically, then, individuals seen to function at this level have the responsibility of carrying out and/or interpreting policy in relation to personnel in a school, branch, or department--one step beyond the classroom level.

3. STAGE THREE--the second level of added responsibility.
Individuals performing at this level would be functioning as the major interpreters of system and ministry policy to other staff. In the schools, they would be principals; in programs they would be program consultants or co-ordinators (i.e., with major responsibility across a system for giving guidance and leadership in program development).

Business staff members and non-teachers in special services departments would be

individuals serving at the level immediately below members of the senior administrative staff. Assistants to senior business superintendents would be included.

The most significant characteristic at this level is service as liaison between staff and senior administrative personnel or with the Ministry of Education. Evaluation of role performance would be very demanding--probably the single most critical task. For school principals, personnel evaluation would be most important, while program personnel (consultants, co-ordinators) would have extensive responsibilities for program evaluation and professional development of staff.

4. STAGE FOUR--the third level of added responsibility.
Personnel at this level would be individuals now serving as academic supervisory officers and senior business officials below the level of chief executive officer. They would serve in the executive or major decision-making bodies of a school system. Qualifications for service at this level would be varied and would relate to specific role demands, the extent of involvement in policy-making, and the range of supervisory responsibilities. School superintendents and superintendents of programs, of operations, of planning, of special services and of business, as well as the board's treasurer, would all be seen to serve at this level. In school systems with large psychological departments or with research or social service units, such departments (system-wide) might well be headed by personnel at this level.

5. STAGE FIVE - Chief executive officer.
This is the senior executive position in a school system--designated in Ontario as the "Director of Education".

2.2 CERTIFICATION PROCESS

In addition to identifying the five stages of the career development plan, legislation must specify the requirements in both experience and training that are necessary to qualify for appointment to positions at each of the levels identified. Table 5 indicates the three areas in which preparation for leadership are perceived to lie. These areas are: experience (relevant to positions sought); formal education (principally at the graduate level); and courses offering practical training in skills related to specific leadership roles (called "certificate courses" in Table 5).

While this report does not give explicit detail regarding the three areas cited, its intent is to recommend strongly that certain criteria govern the design of the actual legislation. Table 5 indicates briefly the nature of the proposed requirements. Some of the factors that should be considered in the writing of the legislation are provided below.

2.2.1 Experience

Traditionally, salary schedules for members of the teaching profession in Ontario have been built on the premise that successful experience adds significantly to the quality of subsequent performance. Given the validity of this premise, one might safely assume that experience at one level of the profession will enhance performance at a succeeding level, where effective performance demands a clear understanding of the requirements of the earlier level.

Table 5: Certification Process in the Five-Stage Career Development Plan

CAREER LEVEL	EXPERIENCE	SPECIAL TRAINING (Post-basic/Graduate)	SCREENING	CERTIFICATE COURSE*
Stage One	+ 5 years	+ Specialist certification OR Four approved graduate courses in education	Proven successful experience	+ Leadership in Education, Session 1
Stage Two				
(a)				+ Leadership in education, Session 2
	+ 1 year	+ Four approved graduate courses in education	Employer-defined process to certify readiness	
(b)				+ Program and administrative leadership in elementary education OR + Program and administrative leadership in secondary education
Stage Three	+ 3 years	+ Two approved graduate courses in education	Employer-defined process to certify readiness	+ An approved course in courses in program and administrative leadership in education not taken previously + An approved course in Senior Management in Education
Stage Four	+ 3 years	+ Two approved graduate courses in education		+ An approved course in Senior Management in Education
Stage Five				

* Certificate Courses to be taken only on completion of all other requirements at that stage.

There are, however, specific characteristics unique to each of the five levels on which the proposed career plan is built. The author recommends that some experience at each level be required as part of the preparation for appointment to a position at the next.

Success as a teacher does not guarantee success in a leadership role with adults. Experience at a relatively minor level of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher should be a legislated requirement prior to appointment to a senior administrative position. Applied literally, the present legislation permits a candidate to qualify for senior positions--even that of chief executive officer--with seven years' experience as a teacher. In view of the highly complex responsibilities of this position this provision is inappropriate.

There are, however, many ways in which readiness for leadership can be manifested. Recognition should be given to the acceptability of such activities as curriculum committee service, or federation executive service, or obvious community leadership as equivalents to experience at the level called Stage Two--the first level of added responsibility.

While academic leadership can likely be effected best by individuals whose basic experience is in teaching, there are many other facets of leadership in educational systems where a background of experience in another field can be of great value. Many professional groups play significant roles in regard to the young people in our schools, and involving these groups in policy-making would help assure consideration of the broad range of criteria affecting child development, rather than just the criteria perceived to relate directly and exclusively to academic learning. Hence legislation should be sufficiently flexible to permit appointment to senior administrative positions of personnel who might serve in the departments of psychological services, social work, research, etc., where the responsibilities include administrative, supervisory, and/or leadership demands comparable with those made of supervisory officers with a teaching background.

Most school systems are now operating on multi-million dollar budgets, with staffs numbering in the thousands and with plants valued in the millions of dollars. Men and women whose background is exclusively in education are very unlikely to have the training necessary for successful administration of the business aspects of such complex organizations. The senior executive bodies need members with advanced training in finance, plant management, and negotiations, to cite a few fields where teaching expertise is largely inapplicable. Effective decision-making in educational systems is more likely to be based on consideration of all relevant factors where membership in the senior decision-making body is representative of many groups rather than just the teaching profession.

2.2.2 Graduate Level Study

Study at the graduate level is recommended to ensure some familiarity with current theory and research and/or the history and philosophical bases for some of the following areas:

-- Administration
-- Curriculum Development
-- Education Politics
-- Leadership
-- Legislation
-- Organizational Behaviour
-- Child Development
-- Educational Finance
-- Evaluation
-- Learning Theories
-- Management
-- Special Education

The range of acceptable courses here should be such that progress could be made towards completing graduate degrees and that individual career aspirations and professional interests could be honoured.

The author has established clearly that many highly relevant courses are currently being offered at some of the faculties of education and at OISE. Discussions with personnel have indicated considerable interest in and a willingness to look towards the design of still others.

A precedent for legislation of the type intended exists in Ontario Regulation 43/55 made under The Deparment of Education Act (1954). An excerpt from this regulation follows.

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL INSPECTORS' CERTIFICATES

INTERPRETATION

In these regulations:

(a) "candidate" means candidate for an Elementary School Inspector's Certificate; and

(b) "deputy minister" means Deputy Minister of Education.

QUALIFICATIONS OF CANDIDATES

(1) A candidate shall hold:

(a) any university degree set out in regulation 4 or a degree the minister deems equivalent thereto under clause b of subsection 1 of section 11 of the Act, and

(b) a Permanent First Class Certificate or a Permanent Elementary School Teacher's Certificate.

(2) A candidate other than a candidate who has been honourable discharged from active service in Her Majesty's forces shall hold certificates of the Ontario College of Education in the following units of the course of study leading to the degree of Bachelor of Pedagogy, or of Bachelor of Education, or of Master of Education:

(a) one of:

(i) Unit 3--Educational Psychology, or
Unit 221--Psychology Applied to Elementary Education, or

(ii) Unit 12--Intelligence and its Measurement, or
Unit 241--Educational Measurement and Evaluation 1;

(b) one of:

(i) Unit 4--School Law and Administration of Education in Ontario, or
Unit 211--School Law and Administration of Education in Ontario, or

(ii) Unit 6--Principles and Practices in School Administration, or
Unit 214--Administration of Public Education in Canada;

(c) one of:

(i) Unit 5--Supervision, or
Unit 212--Supervision, or

(ii) Unit 9--Instructional Techniques and Practices, or
Unit 235--Current Practices in Elementary Education, and

(d) one additional unit chosen from those announced in the current or former calendars of the college.

2.2.3 Certificate Courses

The term certificate courses is used here essentially because Ontario tradition has given certificate recognition for the successful completion of a great many courses required by legislation. The author has found that the majority of educators in Ontario feel the final "blessing" before appointment to the positions under review should continue to be carried out by acknowledging completion of a course based on program and standards common across the province.

It has been indicated earlier in this report that the present manner of accomplishing this particular certification is no longer deemed appropriate. In order to meet the desire for uniformity yet place the responsibility for course delivery in appropriate areas, the author proposes that the key elements of the required courses be defined for the province and that the course offerings then be made by an appropriate agency commiting itself to meet defined conditions of course content, staff, etc.

The courses proposed would be designed to give practical training that could be based on the theoretical background required under other sections of the legislation. Such courses would recognize a range of leadership requirements relating to the role for which candidates are being prepared. Content would vary for candidates with different job orientations, so that equal recognition might be given to courses offered by teachers' federations, organizations of supervisory officials, commercial agencies, or faculties of education. The third recommendation in this report described the means by which such courses would receive the necessary accreditation.

3. IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THERE BE ESTABLISHED IMMEDIATELY A CERTIFICATION COUNCIL WITH MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATIVE OF THOSE AGENCIES WITH A ROLE IN THE PROCESS OF PREPARING PERSONS TO FILL POSITIONS OF RESPONSIBILITY BEYOND THAT OF CLASSROOM TEACHER IN THE SCHOOLS AND SCHOOL SYSTEMS OF ONTARIO, THE COUNCIL'S MANDATE BEING TO EFFECT THE FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS REPORT.

3.0 CERTIFICATION COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP

The intention of this recommendation is the creation of a body representing the various community elements that can legitimately claim an interest in the kind of training and experience demanded of leadership personnel in the province's school systems. A great number of organizations of teachers, supervisory personnel, trustees, and parent groups could all be seen to qualify for inclusion. The Ministry of Education--the ultimate employers of the system's graduates--and the great body of taxpayers can legitimately claim membership as well.

What is envisioned by the author is a small council of persons appointed by the minister to serve as continuing liaison between the government and all bodies served by the public education systems. Such a council could be created by appointing a full-time chairman, probably from the Ministry of Education staff, and three members who could give part-time service as defined by the legislation.

Selecting the members would be done with care, so that representation from the public and separate school systems, the business and academic communities, anglophone and francophone populations, and from both female and male sexes could be assured. Obviously, one member of the council may well meet more than one of these criteria.

One of the three council members should be a member of the Ministry of Education staff, one should be a member of the teaching profession, and the third should be a representative of the general public. Each should have a high degree of credibility with the body represented, and each must have integrity, proven skills of communications and diplomacy, and an understanding of the public education system. Ideally, the third member might well have experience in business and familiarity with personnel development at the management level. Ideally, too, all would have an understanding of the leadership role, preferably through experience.

The mandate for each council member as well as for the council itself must be clearly defined. The ministry representative on the council must be the council's liaison with all branches of the ministry and with any other ministries. This individual would have sufficient service with the government to guarantee quick access to whatever branch or department was needed by the council in its work. Of particular importance would be the individual's credibility with personnel in the regional offices.

The most demanding role in the council would be that of the professional representative whose responsibilities would call upon real strength of character and excellent skills in communication and diplomacy. This individual would be the continuing liaison with all the professional groups associated with public

education, for example, the teachers' federations, the associations of supervisory officials, the school business officials' groups, and the council of deans of the faculties of education. It would be through the professional representative that all such groups or their members would have access to the council on matters pertaining to the preparation of educational leaders.

The non-professional member of the council would be selected to effect liaison with associations of school trustees, parents' groups, and any of the general public who might have an interest in the manner by which leadership personnel are trained for the province's schools and school systems.

It is suggested that the chairman be appointed from the ministry staff in order to ensure a continuing liaison for the minister and senior officials. In view of the possible establishment of a College of Teachers, this requirement could be seen as temporary. Should a College of Teachers be established, the proposed certification council could, and probably should, be transferred. The governing board of the college would then determine the chairmanship.

The certification council's mandate would be essentially be to implement the recommendations of this report. The elements of the mandate as set out on pages 4 and 5 of this report bear some elaboration, which is provided below.

3.1 IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to implement the recommendations, it will be necessary to design and publicize a timeline for the full implementation of the training and certification processes for personnel appointed to positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems.

To effect change in government legislation is a time-consuming process. Part of that time must be given to widespread publication of the proposed change and to the consultation process. The changes must be examined in the context of existing requirements and the way in which a change in the prerequisites to appointment affects individuals already embarked on a career development plan with different requirements.

It is the author's opinion that much advance publicizing has taken place through the meetings he has conducted since February 1982 (see Appendix M). If steps were taken immediately to design the specific legislation and put it before the interested bodies in consultation, implementation could begin in September 1983. Sufficient numbers of graduate courses are now available across the province to meet most educators' needs. The present courses leading to principal's qualifications require only slight modification to meet the intended objectives of the first two certificate courses. The core curriculum for the two courses described as "Program and Administrative Leadership in Elementary/Secondary Education" could be developed in a short time from existing courses. Several faculties of education, many school boards, and certain professional organizations are well able to plan and administer such courses, and each region of the ministry has an active liaison council for principal's courses to effect appropriate monitoring of courses.

The courses called here "Senior Management in Education" have not existed formally, but many boards and several professional organizations have undertaken programs that would be very appropriate. These could be expanded and refined to provide an acceptable base for suitable courses. The first of these two might well concentrate very heavily on the legislation and on management principles and culminate in the sort of examination now demanded for certification as a supervisory officer. Several such courses reflecting various areas of leadership could be developed from existing programs. For example the Ontario Association of School Business Officials has for years offered its members a number of very fine courses that highly deserve recognition and acceptance.

Early implementation depends largely on how quickly the concept of a certification council is accepted and its membership appointed.

3.2 LEGISLATION

In order to implement the recommendations, it will be necessary to design appropriate legislation defining the requirements in:

basic formal education,
experience, and
special training

declared to be prerequisite to appointment to positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems.

The intent of the legislation is set out in the report. It would be necessary for the council to call upon the resources of the ministry's Policy Analysis and Legislation Branch to write the legislation; the council would then ratify the legislation, to ensure that it reflects the recommendation's intent. The council of deans of the faculties of education and the senior administrators from OISE have indicated their support and their willingness to identify the present courses that serve the needs implicit in the recommendations.

Many courses offered by teachers' federations and other associations are now in place and are simply waiting for recognition.

3.3 CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY

In order to implement the recommendations, it will be necessary to design appropriate legislation defining requirements for continuing eligibility for persons holding or eligible to hold positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems.

Through the past year the author's audiences have generally taken the position that the absence of any requirements for professional updating is doing the profession and its clients a serious disservice. There are now many opportunities for professional development but no requirement in law for personnel who have held certification for many years prior to actual appointment or who have held positions of added responsibility for extended periods. This is believed

unacceptable, and it is recommended that a requirement for professional development on a regular basis be imposed by legislation.

A great many workshops, seminars, and courses now exist which, given proper recognition, could easily meet the requirement. It remains only for the council to acquire the necessary information on which to base its acceptance or rejection.

3.4 ACCEPTABLE COURSES

In order to implement the recommendations, it will be necessary to identify and state clearly the criteria for accepting courses, programs, and/or experience as components of the legislated prerequisites for appointment to positions of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems, such identification to include:

3.4.1 the core content of courses and programs

3.4.2 the general nature and duration of acceptable experience

3.4.3 the auspices under which courses can be delivered

3.4.4 the process for accreditation of courses and programs and for certification of acceptable experience.

As already suggested, much of the work entailed here has been done, insofar as course outlines and content are concerned. Some of the criteria for experience have been suggested. It is the author's conviction that the interpretation of acceptable equivalence for courses or experience can best be done by a body somewhat removed from the bureaucracy and in frequent contact with the school systems, the work world, and the post-secondary training institutions. Many decisions can be made on the basis of a defined set of criteria, but there will always be individual cases well worth the thoughtful consideration of such a body as the proposed council.

Given a clear set of criteria, there is no reason why approval for the administration should not be given to any of several agencies. Most have been mentioned several times and include school boards, faculties of education, professional organizations, and commercial agencies. As has been stated clearly elsewhere, the Ministry of Education is not now an appropriate agency. Simply stated, its responsibility is policy-making, not service delivery.

Regional education councils with ministry representation, the school boards, and the faculties constitute the appropriate bodies to effect course monitoring. They have demonstrated since July 1, 1981 both the interest and the ability to be engaged productively in several aspects of the existing certification processes and an eagerness to be so involved in the future.

3.5 CERTIFICATE RECOGNITION

In order to implement the recommendations, it will be necessary to determine what recognition, if any, the Ministry of Education should give to personnel who meet the defined requirements for eligibility to appointment to a position of responsibility beyond that of classroom teacher in Ontario schools and school systems.

Several organizations and individuals have expressed a need for some kind of certificate indicating eligibility for appointment to positions of added responsibility. At present such certificates have been abandoned for all but individuals qualified as supervisory officers. This certificate, emblazoned with an impressive gold seal, has been issued only in the past few years.

The author does not rank as a great concern the issuance of a certificate and has no recommendation to make other than that the question be considered. It may well be an important matter to many. Should formal certification be instituted, the certificate might take one of several forms and be issued under varying circumstances. One very interesting concept has been the issuing of certificates to individuals who have met not only the legislated requirements for eligibility to appointment but who also have been formally interviewed by a prospective employer (a school board) and been accepted for appointment. The certificate would then be the minister's endorsement of appointment--but only to a position in a particular board.

3.6 TRANSITION LEGISLATION

In order to implement the recommendations, it will be necessary to design transition legislation to deal with:

3.6.1 the status of persons presently qualified (fully or partially) under existing legislation

3.6.2 the means by which positions affected by the new legislation might be filled during the period between its initial implementation and the availability of adequate numbers of fully qualified persons to fill such positions.

This important element of the council's mandate could be best effected by examining the traditional methods of dealing with change in regulations pertaining to qualifications and by examining the numbers of qualified persons against the estimated needs. The author has found a great many educators who suggest that the "deeming" of individuals to be qualified should be done with great care. It is the opinion of many that changes in requirements should be imposed on all candidates, whether they are qualified under existing regulations or not. This would suggest that a time limit be imposed on those presently qualified who lack the requirements under the changed regulations. The onus, then, is on personnel who lack the new requirements to acquire them within a given time. The author endorses this position strongly and would recommend that, at the very least, individuals now qualified for appointment to positions at higher levels be required to meet the new

requirements before being eligible. An example is the author himself. Qualified under present regulations to serve as chief executive officer, he lacks the proposed requirement of "an approved course in Senior Management in Education". The author's recommendation is that this particular course requirement be imposed before eligibility for promotion is considered.

Conclusion

The individuals met during the author's travels seem to support overwhelmingly the need for the ministry to retain a perceived control of the "final selection" of leadership personnel for the province's school systems. There is almost a mystique about the certificate, which few, if any, wish to sacrifice--or even to probe.

There is a decided reluctance on the part of trustees and administrators to be forced to make decisions regarding the appointment of leadership personnel without the control over numbers that provincial certification is seen to effect. Staff seem to fear political intervention and nepotism, while trustees seem to lack faith in their own collective wisdom and trust in their existing leadership personnel.

Present courses do not address effectively the needs of leadership personnel, for at least two reasons:

a) there is not an adequate framework for courses or for recognizing current roles;

b) the range of background, experience, and training is far too broad, with some candidates coming into programs with graduate degrees and others with virtually no training beyond an undergraduate degree and subject-oriented certification.

At present there is no requirement for pre-course training in such areas as those mentioned earlier so that course leaders attempt to do all of that and more in two four-week courses. In addition to certain inadequacies, the present legislation permitting the certification as supervisory officer of personnel unqualified for admission to principals courses is monumentally ludicrous.

While attempting to fulfil an already very broad mandate, personnel in the ministry's central offices are not able to give the time or energy needed to provide strong, creative leadership to training courses; hence they cannot create an environment in which such leadership potential can be inspired and/or developed in others. Many staff members seem to have either the interest or the background for doing what ought to be done.

In this regard, it seems that a very critical look should be taken at the personnel given responsibilities in this area, with a view to selecting carefully people who have both the interest and the necessary qualifications. Surely, if leadership positions are sufficiently important that we require special training, those who effect the training should be the strongest leaders--and best administrators--we can find. All of this I say recognizing that there is a fine core of strong, capable men and women available as a resource in this enterprise.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: OPINION SURVEY RE CERTIFICATION AND TRAINING OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORY OFFICERS

A. CERTIFICATION - Ontario is almost unique in its demand for specific certification of principals and supervisory officers prior to appointment to such positions. Issues and Directions (1980) raises the question of the appropriateness of this process. Please indicate your view in response to the following question.

WHAT IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE AGENCY FOR THE CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS? IF YOU FEEL THAT THERE IS A DIFFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OR ACADEMIC/BUSINESS SUPERVISORY OFFICERS OR THAT MORE ONE SHOULD BE INVOLVED, PLEASE INDICATE.

	Pr's.		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) None is needed	___	___	___	___
b) Ministry of Education	___	___	___	___
c) Ministry of Colleges and Universities	___	___	___	___
d) Professional organization(s)	___	___	___	___
e) Faculties of Education	___	___	___	___
f) *College of Teachers	___	___	___	___

* As proposed in Issues and Directions, the College of Teachers is seen as a profession. In view of the very limited definition you may wish to add qualifying terms.

B. PRE-APPOINTMENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: What should be required? check one or more

a) Teaching certificate	___	___	___	___
b) Less than 5 years' successful teaching experience (Ontario)	___	___	___	___
c) At least 5 years'successful teaching experience (Ontario)	___	___	___	___
d) At least 7 years' successful teaching experience (Ontario)	___	___	___	___
e) More than 7 years' successful teaching experience (Ontario)	___	___	___	___

	Pr's.		S.O.'s.	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
f) Graduate degree -- Masters level	___	___	___	___
g) Graduate degree -- Doctoral level	___	___	___	___
h) Internship experience--three months	___	___	___	___
i) Internship experience--six months	___	___	___	___
j) Internship experience--one year	___	___	___	___
k) Internship experience--more than one year	___	___	___	___
l) Experience in position of responsibility at level below principal	___	___	___	___
m) Experience as principal	___	___	___	___

C. LEGISLATION TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Given that a prescribed training program is desirable, who should "write the prescription" for principals and supervisory officers (i.e., what agency should determine what training program is necessary)?

	Pr's.		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) The aspirant to the position	___	___	___	___
b) The Ministry of Education	___	___	___	___
c) The College of Teachers	___	___	___	___
d) The employing body	___	___	___	___
e) Faculties of education	___	___	___	___
f) Professional associations (federations, OAEAO*, etc.)	___	___	___	___

*i.e., provincial associations of supervisory officers.

D. ELEMENTS OF A TRAINING PROGRAM

Indicate by number (1, 2, or 3) the importance you feel pertains to courses designed to effect the development of the following competencies in educational leaders at the four levels shown:

1. Absolutely essential
2. Very important
3. Of secondary importance

	Pr's.		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) Communication skills	___	___	___	___
b) Conceptual skills	___	___	___	___
c) Curriculum development skills	___	___	___	___
d) Decision-making skills	___	___	___	___
e) Education finance	___	___	___	___
f) Evaluation skills (personnel)	___	___	___	___
g) Evaluation skills (program)	___	___	___	___
h) Human relations skills	___	___	___	___
i) Knowledge of curriculum (content)	___	___	___	___
j) Knowledge of educational systems	___	___	___	___
k) Knowledge of educational theory/ philosophy	___	___	___	___
l) Knowledge of educational methods and issues	___	___	___	___
m) Knowledge of educational law	___	___	___	___
n) Leadership skills	___	___	___	___
o) Managerial/administrative skills	___	___	___	___
p) Organizational skills	___	___	___	___
q) Political skills	___	___	___	___
r) Professional development skills	___	___	___	___

E. ISSUES -- YOUR ATTITUDES

Certain recommendations from Issues and Directions have been referred to. Please set out your thoughts on those not dealt with in section A to D of this survey.

		Yes	No
a)	*College of Teachers		
i)	Should be established	___	___
ii)	If established, should be designed by:		
	ministry personnel	___	___
	federation personnel	___	___
	other (specify)	___	___
iii)	If established, should include:		
	teachers, elementary	___	___
	teachers, secondary	___	___
	teachers, post-secondary	___	___
	program support staff (i.e., non-school staff)	___	___
	department heads	___	___
	vice-principals	___	___
	principals	___	___
Municipal	supervisory officers (academic, below director's level)	___	___
Municipal	directors of education	___	___
Provincial	supervisory officers (academic, all levels)	___	___
Provincial	deputy minister	___	___

iv) Comment: _____

_____

_____

*See note in Section A.

b) Term Appointments to Positions of Responsibility

		Yes	No
i)	Acceptable in principle	___	___
ii)	If acceptable, should apply to:		
	Program support staff (i.e., non-school staff	___	___
	department heads	___	___
	vice-principals	___	___
	principals	___	___
Municipal	supervisory officers (academic, below director's level	___	___
Municipal	directors of education	___	___
Provincial	supervisory officers (academic, all levels)	___	___
Provincial	deputy minister	___	___

iii) Comment: _____

_____

_____

c) Legislation re Duties

		Yes	No
i)	Ministry should write:		
	-- for principals	___	___
	-- for supervisory officers	___	___
ii)	Boards should write:		
	-- for principals	___	___
	-- for supervisory officers	___	___

iii) Comment: _____

_____

_____

_____

d) Further Comment or Direction
(attach sheets if additional space needed)

DATE: _____ LOCATION: _____

I.D.:	El.	Sec.			
Teachers	____	____	Sup'y Off. Ac.	____	____
Vice-Prin.	____	____	Sup'y Off. Bus.	____	____
Prin.	____	____	Trustee	____	

Other _____
(please specify)

RETURN TO: Dr. R. F. Thomas
Special Project Officer
Ministry of Colleges and Universities
Room 1559, Mowat Block
Queen's Park, Toronto, Ontario
M7A 1L2 (Tel. 965-2228)

APPENDIX B: PROGRAMS LEADING TO PRINCIPAL'S QUALIFICATIONS

Dates	Program Length	Qualification Title	Qualification Scope
1951-56	4 weeks Alternately HSPC/VC	High School Principal's Cert.	High school principal
		Vocational Principal's Cert.	Voc. school principal
1957-65	2 summers 4 weeks each summer	Sec. School Principal's Cert.	Sec. school principal
1966-68	4 weeks	Interim Sec. School Principal's Cert., Type B	Sec. school vice-principal Sec. school principal (fewer than 500) Special voc. school principal
	4 weeks	Sec. School Principal's Cert., Type A	Sec. school principal
	4 weeks	Interim Elem. School Principal's Cert.	Elem. school principal
1969-78	4 weeks	Interim Sec. School Principal Cert., Type B	Sec. school vice-principal Sec. school principal (fewer than 500) Special voc. school principal
	4 weeks	Interim Sec. School Principal's Cert., Type A	Sec. school principal
	4 weeks	Interim Elem. School Principal's Cert.	Elem. school principal

1978	4 weeks -- Session I (407/78)	Interim Sec. School Principal's Cert., Type B	Sec. school vice-principal Sec. school principal (fewer than 500) Special voc. school principal
	4 weeks -- Session I (407/78)	Interim Elem. School Principal's Cert.	Elem. school principal
	4 weeks -- Session II (407/78)	Prog. Supervision Assessment Qual.	Elem/sec. school principal (in Ontario in which holder is qualified to teach -- Ont. Reg. 704/78, sections 10 and 11)
1979-80	4 weeks	Program Development and Implementation	NIL
	4 weeks	Program Supervision and Assessment	Elem. or sec. School principal (in Ontario in which holder is qualified to teach -- Ont. Reg. 704/78, sections 10 and 11)

PRESENT STATUS

1980-81	4 weeks/125 hours November-April	Program Development and Implementation	NIL
	4 weeks/125 hours	Program Supervision and Assessment	Elem. or sec. school principal (in Ontario in which holder is qualified to teach -- Ont. Reg. 704/78, sections 10 and 11)

1981-82	4 weeks	Program Development and Implementation	NIL
	4 weeks/125 hours October-April	Program Supervision and Assessment	Elem. or Principal (in Ontario in which holder is qualified to teach -- Ont. Reg. 704/78, sections 10 and 11)

N.B.: ALL PRIOR CERTIFICATES RETAIN THEIR FORMER VALIDITY.

INTERIM CERTIFICATES DO NOT LAPSE AND ARE MADE PERMANENT WHEN THE REQUIREMENTS OF NUMBERED MEMORANDUM 70-71:7 ARE SATSIFIED.

APPENDIX C: PROGRAMS LEADING TO PRINCIPAL'S QUALIFICATIONS ENROLMENT 1969-1982

ENROLMENTS -- 1969-78

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978
Elementary School Principals	310	297	605	687	536	544	565	585	522	208
Secondary School Principals	344	298	404	425	383	433	350	328	314	420
TOTALS	654	595	1009	1112	919	977	915	913	836	628

ENROLMENTS -- 1979-82

	1979	1980	1980-81 (N. York)	1981	1981-82 (N. York)	1982
Program Development and Implementation	433	345	1127	973	----	816
Program Supervision and Assessment	393	450	205	446	900	1124
TOTALS	826	795	1332	1419	900	1940

APPENDIX D: SUPERVISORY OFFICER'S CERTIFICATION EXAMINATION CANDIDATE NUMBERS AND SUCCESS RATES, 1973-1982

	No. of Candidates	Written		Oral		Rec'd. Cert.	
		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1973	138	109	75.0	135	48.1	62	44.8
1974	331	190	64.2	235	50.0	107	32.0
1975	341	212	63.2	261	54.4	124	36.0
1976	289	201	85.9	163	60.0	169	58.0
1977	305	84	36.5	164	57.0	96	31.4
1978	324	52	19.4	138	53.2	72	22.2
1979	300	169	62.3	110	53.1	154	51.3
1980	271	170	73.9	163	71.4	176	64.9
1981	237	144	69.5	115	65.3	131	55.2
1982	293	257	32.3	116	62.0	74	25.2

EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1982

A. Numbers of Candidates

	Male	Female	Total
Candidates accepted	314	81	395
Candidates cancelled	83	19	102
Examined overall	229	64	293
First-Time candidates	163	56	229
Written	200	57	257
Oral	89	27	116
Ministry	5	3	8
Francophone	17	4	21
Business	8	--	8
With M. Ed	71	57	128
Without M. Ed	156	9	165

B. Successes by Candidates' Positions

	No. of Candidates			Eligible for Certificate			
Position	M	F	T	M	F	T	%
Teacher	29	14	43	6	4	10	23.2
Department head	8	1	9	2	-	2	22.2
Vice-Principal	36	12	48	8	4	12	25.0
Principal	106	12	118	23	4	27	22.8
Consultant	3	7	10	-	1	1	10.0
Business	8	-	8	2	-	2	25.0
Other (incl. ministry)	40	17	57	14	6	20	35.0
			293			74	

APPENDIX E: OPINION SURVEY RE CERTIFICATION AND TRAINING OF PRINCIPALS AND SUPERVISORY OFFICERS

A. CERTIFICATION - Ontario is almost unique in its demand for specific certification of principals and supervisory officers prior to appointment to such positions. Issues and Directions (1980) raises the question of the appropriateness of this process. Please indicate your view in response to the following question.

WHAT IS THE MOST APPROPRIATE AGENCY FOR THE CERTIFICATION OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS? IF YOU FEEL THAT THERE IS A DIFFERENCE WITH RESPECT TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS OR ACADEMIC/BUSINESS SUPERVISORY OFFICERS OR THAT MORE THAN ONE SHOULD BE INVOLVED, PLEASE INDICATE.

	Pr's.		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) None is needed	1.6*	1.3	2.1	4.1
b) Ministry of Education	61.0	59.7	64.5	53.5
c) **Ministry of Colleges and Universities	7.6	7.2	8.3	7.7
d) Professional organization(s)	22.3	21.5	17.7	25.0
e) Faculties of education	11.4	11.4	8.8	5.6
f)***College of Teachers	39.4	38.1	27.7	17.8

*Unless stated otherwise, figures indicate the percentages of those who responded who support the position indicated.

**MCU identified in presentation as the Teacher Education Branch then responsible for administration of certification processes

***As proposed in Issues and Direction, the College of Teachers is seen as a professional licensing body for all members of the profession. In view of the very limited definition you may wish to add qualifying terms.

B. PRE-APPOINTMENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: What should be required? (check one or more)

a) Teaching certificate	80.5	77.1	71.5	29.6
b) Less than 5 years' successful teaching experience (Ontario)	1.9	1.5	1.0	3.8**
c) At least 5 years'successful teaching experience (Ontario)	57.1	53.4	39.0	23.0**

	Pr's.		S.O.'s.	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
d) At least 7 years' successful teaching experience (Ontario)	20.3	20.1	18.1	8.5**
e) More than 7 years' successful teaching experience (Ontario)	14.7	15.2	23.3	10.6**
f) Graduate degree -- Masters level	51.8	54.4	59.4	40.2
g) Graduate degree -- Doctoral level	0.7	1.0	6.6	2.7
h) Internship experience--three months	6.0	5.4	4.6	4.0
i) Internship experience--six months	6.1	6.2	6.0	5.3
j) Internship experience--one year	30.3	29.6	27.8	22.5
k) Internship experience--more than one year	7.1	7.3	8.8	9.3
l) Experience in position of responsibility at level below principal	47.6	52.8	33.2	(14.9)
m) Experience as principal			59.3	(16.7)

**On instruction, teaching experience was read as relevant business experience for resources in items b through e, column 4.

C. LEGISLATION TRAINING REQUIREMENTS

Given that a prescribed training program is desirable, who should "write the prescription" for principals and supervisory officers (i.e., what agency should determine what training program is necessary)?

	Pr's.		S.O.'s	
	El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a) The aspirant to the position	9.9	9.5	7.9	6.5
b) The Ministry of Education	62.8	61.2	65.0	51.9
c) The College of Teachers	38.5	37.9	28.2	16.7
d) The employing body	22.4	21.2	21.6	26.0

e)	Faculties of education	12.6	12.5	10.4	6.5
f)	Professional associations (federations, OAEAO*, etc.)	37.0	35.6	34.1	30.4

*i.e., provincial associations of supervisory officers.

D. ELEMENTS OF A TRAINING PROGRAM

Indicate by number (1, 2, or 3) the importance you feel pertains to courses designed to effect the development of the following competencies in educational leaders at the four levels shown:

1. Absolutely essential
2. Very important
3. Of secondary importance

		Pr's.		S.O.'s	
		El.	Sec.	Ac.	Bus.
a)	Communication skills	86/08/02	83/08/02	83/06/02	65/15/05
b)	Conceptual Skills	43/39/08	42/37/07	51/28/06	37/28/12
c)	Curriculum development skills	53/34/07	47/36/09	52/27/09	11/12/52
d)	Decision-making skills	82/11/02	81/10/04	82/07/02	73/09/02
e)	Education finance	07/44/40	09/45/35	33/42/13	74/07/05
f)	Evaluation skills (personnel)	74/17/01	73/16/01	71/15/02	31/19/29
g)	Evaluation skills (program)	68/22/02	64/23/02	67/16/03	18/17/42
h)	Human relations skills	84/10/01	81/10/01	78/11/01	54/21/08
i)	Knowledge of curriculum (content)	48/36/10	40/37/13	40/33/15	06/15/57
j)	Knowledge of educational systems	21/47/24	22/47/21	54/27/07	38/26/18
k)	Knowledge of educational theory/ philosophy	39/44/11	38/43/11	53/29/07	14/29/38
l)	Knowledge of educational methods and issues	53/36/04	52/35/04	62/24/03	20/31/29
m)	Knowledge of educational law	46/40/08	47/37/06	72/14/03	55/19/09
n)	Leadership skills	87/07/01	86/06/01	81/08/02	52/21/10
o)	Managerial/administrative skills	55/35/03	58/32/02	65/21/03	71/12/03
p)	Organizational skills	69/24/01	69/21/01	69/17/02	67/14/03
q)	Political skills	27/45/22	29/43/19	58/23/09	43/25/14
r)	Professional development skills	46/40/07	45/38/07	49/32/07	18/28/34

E. ISSUES -- YOUR ATTITUDES

Certain recommendations from Issues and Directions have been referred to. Please set out your thoughts on those not dealt with in section A to D of this survey.

		Yes	No
a)	*College of Teachers		
i)	Should be established	82.4	N=2109
ii)	If established, should be designed by:		
	ministry personnel	67.6	___
	federation personnel	78.5	___
	other (specify)	16.7	___
iii)	If established, should include:		
	teachers, elementary	97.1	___
	teachers, secondary	97.2	___
	teachers, post-secondary	59.4	___
	program support staff (i.e., non-school staff)	43.0	___
	department heads	83.3	___
	vice-principals	85.0	___
	principals	91.7	___
Municipal	supervisory officers (academic, below director's level)	69.1	___
Municipal	directors of education	59.2	___
Provincial	supervisory officers (academic, all levels)	61.5	___
Provincial	deputy minister	47.2	___

*See note in Section A.

iv) Comment: _____

_____

_____

b) Term Appointments to Positions of Responsibility

		Yes	No
i)	Acceptable in principle	86.8	N=1831
ii)	If acceptable, should apply to:		
	program support staff (i.e., non-school staff	63.9	___
	department heads	82.3	___
	vice-principals	78.6	___
	principals	72.4	___
Municipal	supervisory officers (academic, below director's level	73.4	___
Municipal	directors of education	66.2	___
Provincial	supervisory officers (academic all levels)	70.2	___
Provincial	deputy minister	58.7	___

iii) Comment: _____

_____

_____

c) Legislation re Duties

		Yes	No
i)	Ministry should write:		
	-- for principals	77.9	___
	-- for supervisory officers	83.6	___
ii)	Boards should write:		
	-- for principals	51.9	___
	-- for supervisory officers	46.9	___

iii) Comment: _____

_____

_____

_____

d) Further Comment or Direction
(attach sheets if additional space needed)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

DATE: _____ LOCATION: _____

I.D.:	El.	Sec.			
Teachers	390	342	Sup'y Off. Ac.	168	____
Vice-Prin.	272	141	Sup'y Off. Bus.	28	____
Prin.	618	131	Trustee	22	
Other	219 - Consultants, Ed. Officers (MOE), etc. (please specify)				

TOTAL 2331

APPENDIX F: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -- RESPONSES BY CLIENT GROUP

Question A: Certification

	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
A CERTIFICATION											
a) None Needed											
- El.Pr.	0.5	1.2	1.1	1.4	1.9	3.1	0.0	2.7	2.4	0.0	1.6
- Sec.Pr.	0.5	1.2	0.7	1.4	1.5	3.1	0.0	1.8	2.4	0.0	1.3
- S.O.Ac.	1.0	1.2	0.7	4.3	2.6	3.1	4.5	2.3	1.8	10.7	2.1
- S.O.Bu.	2.3	2.0	4.8	5.7	4.2	5.3	9.1	4.1	3.6	28.6	4.1
b) MOE											
- El.Pr.	61.5	52.9	58.5	61.7	63.9	59.5	68.2	60.3	71.4	53.6	61.0
- Sec.Pr.	59.7	55.6	55.1	65.2	57.8	67.2	68.2	60.7	70.2	53.6	59.7
- S.O.Ac.	64.1	64.0	65.1	63.1	61.5	61.8	54.5	65.3	81.0	60.7	64.5
- S.O.Bu.	49.2	53.5	52.2	60.3	50.2	49.6	45.5	58.0	72.0	46.4	53.5
c) MCU (Teacher Ed.)											
- El.Pr.	8.7	8.2	6.3	3.5	9.7	3.8	9.1	6.4	6.0	3.6	7.6
- Sec.Pr.	8.5	8.5	5.1	2.8	8.9	3.8	9.1	6.4	6.0	3.6	7.2
- S.O.Ac.	10.8	10.2	6.6	4.3	9.9	5.3	9.1	5.9	5.4	3.6	8.3
- S.O.Bu.	10.5	6.1	9.6	6.4	7.8	4.6	9.1	6.4	5.4	3.6	7.7
d) Prof. organizations											
- El.Pr.	21.3	21.1	25.7	19.1	27.2	18.3	9.1	17.4	19.6	10.7	22.3
- Sec.Pr.	20.8	22.2	22.8	21.3	24.1	23.7	9.1	15.5	19.6	10.7	21.5
- S.O.Ac.	16.7	15.2	17.6	15.6	19.6	16.8	18.2	12.3	27.4	21.4	17.7
- S.O.Bu.	27.2	24.6	24.6	19.1	25.4	22.1	22.7	19.6	32.7	32.1	25.0
e) Faculties											
- El.Pr.	13.1	10.2	8.8	7.1	13.4	9.2	18.2	9.1	14.3	10.7	11.4
- Sec.Pr.	12.1	12.0	9.2	9.2	11.8	9.9	18.2	10.0	14.3	10.7	11.4
- S.O.Ac.	11.0	7.9	9.2	5.7	9.4	9.9	9.1	6.8	7.7	7.1	8.8
- S.O.Bu.	7.9	5.6	6.6	3.5	4.7	5.3	4.5	6.4	3.6	0.0	5.6
f) Coll. of Tchrs.											
- El.Pr.	46.2	47.7	43.8	44.0	36.6	28.2	4.5	42.0	21.4	7.1	39.4
- Sec.Pr.	43.8	48.2	42.3	44.7	33.2	32.8	4.5	39.7	22.0	7.1	38.1
- S.O.Ac.	33.1	36.0	28.7	34.8	23.6	19.8	4.5	33.8	11.3	3.6	27.7
- S.O.Bu.	23.3	23.1	19.1	22.7	14.2	8.4	4.5	21.5	7.7	3.6	17.8

APPENDIX G: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -- RESPONSES BY CLIENT GROUP

Question B: Pre-Appointment Professional Development

B PRE-APPOINTMENT PROFESSIONAL DVLPMENT	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
a) Teaching Cert.											
- El.Pr.	85.9	73.4	85.3	76.6	82.2	67.2	68.2	81.3	87.5	53.6	80.5
- Sec.Pr.	82.1	75.7	79.4	79.4	72.5	73.3	72.7	79.0	85.7	50.0	77.1
- S.O.Ac.	77.7	69.3	74.3	71.6	65.4	64.9	68.2	77.6	80.4	50.0	71.5
- S.O.Bu.	42.6	32.2	34.9	29.8	22.5	22.9	22.7	28.3	23.2	3.6	29.6
b) 5 yrs' Exp											
- El.Pr.	2.3	2.9	1.5	2.1	1.3	0.8	4.5	1.8	2.4	0.0	1.9
- Sec.Pr. (T'g)	2.3	2.3	0.4	2.1	0.8	0.8	4.5	1.4	1.8	0.0	1.5
- S.O.Ac. (T'g)	0.8	1.8	0.4	1.4	0.8	2.3	4.5	0.9	0.6	0.0	1.0
- S.O.Bu. (Bus.)	3.3	3.8	3.7	7.8	2.9	4.6	0.0	5.0	3.0	3.6	3.8
c) At least 5 yrs' Experience											
- El. Pr.	53.1	57.3	57.7	51.8	61.3	59.5	40.9	57.1	58.9	32.1	57.1
- Sec.Pr. (T'g)	50.5	56.7	52.6	52.5	51.9	58.0	36.4	56.2	58.9	32.1	53.4
- S.O.Ac. (T'g)	38.7	43.3	39.3	43.3	35.9	42.0	27.3	41.1	38.7	17.9	39.0
- S.O.Bu. (Bus.)	30.5	27.5	25.0	29.1	18.6	20.6	4.5	17.8	17.9	10.7	23.0
d) At least 7 yrs' Experience											
- El.Pr.	22.1	19.9	16.9	20.6	20.9	14.5	36.4	21.0	22.6	14.3	20.3
- Sec.Pr. (T'g)	20.8	14.9	15.4	22.0	19.6	19.1	31.8	20.1	22.0	14.3	20.1
- S.O.Ac. (T'g)	18.5	18.7	13.2	18.4	18.0	13.0	22.7	17.4	27.4	25.0	18.1
- S.O.Bu. (Bus.)	10.8	9.9	6.6	10.7	6.6	4.6	18.2	7.3	10.1	14.3	8.5
e) 7 yrs' Exper.											
- El.Pr.	19.7	14.0	18.0	15.6	13.3	10.7	9.1	11.9	11.9	10.7	14.7
- Sec.Pr. (T'g)	19.0	14.9	18.0	17.0	13.3	13.0	22.7	12.8	12.5	10.7	15.2
- S.O.Ac. (T'g)	25.1	19.9	28.7	22.0	21.5	19.8	22.7	26.0	25.0	14.3	23.3
- S.O.Bu. (Bus.)	13.8	11.7	14.3	7.8	8.3	6.9	13.6	12.3	6.0	7.1	10.6
f) Master's Degree											
- El.Pr.	50.3	36.8	60.7	39.0	62.0	38.2	40.9	51.1	62.5	25.0	51.8
- Sec.Pr.	52.6	45.0	58.8	48.9	57.9	49.6	54.5	57.5	64.9	32.1	54.4
- S.O.Ac.	59.7	51.8	61.4	56.0	58.6	45.8	45.5	70.8	79.8	25.0	59.4
- S.O.Bu.	45.4	36.0	47.4	36.9	39.6	21.4	31.8	44.3	44.0	21.4	40.2

...Cont'd B Pre-App't Prof. Devel	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
g) Doctoral Degree											
- El.Pr.	0.8	0.6	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.0	4.5	0.9	1.8	0.0	0.7
- Sec.Pr.	0.8	0.6	0.7	0.0	1.5	1.5	4.5	0.9	1.2	0.0	1.0
- S.O.Ac.	8.7	3.2	10.3	2.1	7.4	6.9	13.6	3.7	6.5	3.6	6.6
- S.O.Bu.	5.6	1.2	3.7	0.0	2.4	1.5	9.1	2.7	1.8	0.0	2.7
h) Internship - 3 mos.											
- El.Pr.	4.1	7.9	4.4	3.5	5.3	4.6	0.0	9.6	11.3	3.6	6.0
- Sec.Pr.	3.8	7.6	3.3	4.3	4.4	4.6	0.0	8.2	11.3	3.6	5.4
- S.O.Ac.	2.8	4.1	3.3	2.8	4.2	3.8	0.0	6.8	13.1	3.6	4.6
- S.O.Bu.	3.3	4.1	4.0	2.8	3.6	3.8	4.5	3.7	8.9	3.6	4.0
i) Internship - 6 mos.											
- El.Pr.	5.1	6.1	2.6	8.5	6.8	6.9	4.5	4.6	11.9	0.0	6.1
- Sec.Pr.	5.1	5.8	2.9	8.5	6.6	6.9	4.5	5.9	12.5	0.0	6.2
- S.O.Ac.	5.6	7.3	4.4	6.4	4.2	3.8	0.0	7.8	14.3	3.6	6.0
- S.O.Bu.	5.9	6.1	4.4	5.7	3.6	5.3	0.0	6.4	9.5	3.6	5.3
j) Internship - 1 Yr.											
- El.Pr.	35.1	30.4	29.4	25.5	31.4	26.0	27.3	30.1	27.4	14.3	30.3
- Sec.Pr.	32.8	32.2	27.9	27.7	28.0	31.3	27.3	30.6	27.4	10.7	29.6
- S.O.Ac.	27.4	30.1	24.3	24.1	27.5	23.7	27.3	31.5	35.1	7.1	27.8
- S.O.Bu	25.9	25.7	20.2	15.6	21.8	16.0	18.2	25.1	24.4	10.7	22.5
k) Internship-1 Yr. +											
- El.Pr.	9.0	2.0	8.5	10.6	10.0	5.3	4.5	4.6	2.4	7.1	7.1
- Sec.Pr.	10.0	2.6	7.7	12.8	8.7	5.3	4.5	6.4	2.4	10.7	7.3
- S.O.Ac.	13.6	4.4	10.7	12.1	10.0	6.1	13.6	5.5	2.4	10.7	8.8
- S.O.Bu.	11.5	5.8	9.9	9.9	10.8	4.6	31.8	7.3	3.6	28.6	9.3
l) Pre-App't Ad. Exp. (below P'n)											
- El.Pr.	45.9	36.8	65.4	44.7	53.9	34.4	40.9	47.0	38.1	35.7	47.6
- Sec.Pr.	46.7	54.4	60.7	69.5	50.6	55.7	45.5	55.7	42.9	35.7	52.8
- S.O.Ac.	30.8	31.9	39.3	44.0	32.0	26.7	22.7	41.6	26.8	10.7	33.2
- S.O.Bu.	17.2	17.3	17.3	18.4	12.6	9.2	13.6	18.3	8.3	3.6	14.9
m) Pre-App't Ad. Exp. (as Principal)											
- El.Pr.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
- Sec.Pr.	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
- S.O.Ac.	60.8	53.8	62.9	66.0	62.3	66.4	22.7	49.3	59.5	46.4	59.3
- S.O.Bu.	23.6	18.4	20.6	14.2	1.52	13.0	4.5	13.7	8.9	3.6	16.7

APPENDIX H: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -- RESPONSES BY CLIENT GROUP

Question C: Legislated Training Requirements

C TRAINING REQUIREMENTS	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
a) Defined by Individual aspirant											
- El.Pr.	12.8	8.5	9.2	9.2	12.5	6.9	4.5	8.7	4.8	0.0	9.9
- Sec.Pr.	12.3	9.4	8.1	9.9	11.0	7.6	4.5	8.7	4.8	0.0	9.5
- S.O.Ac.	9.0	7.3	7.7	8.5	9.5	5.3	4.5	7.8	3.6	0.0	7.9
- S.O.Bu.	7.2	6.1	6.6	7.1	7.6	4.6	4.5	6.4	3.6	0.0	6.5
b) Defined by MOE											
- El.Pr.	62.8	61.1	59.6	56.0	64.9	60.3	68.2	61.6	73.2	57.1	62.8
- Sec.Pr.	61.0	62.9	55.1	60.3	57.6	70.2	68.2	63.0	72.0	57.1	61.2
- S.O.Ac.	64.9	67.8	65.4	58.9	62.1	61.8	50.0	68.0	77.4	53.6	65.0
- S.O.Bu.	49.7	57.3	54.0	53.9	45.3	45.8	36.4	57.1	66.7	42.9	51.9
c) Defined by College of Teachers											
- El.Pr.	43.1	48.2	40.4	48.2	35.1	24.4	9.1	42.5	23.8	10.7	38.5
- Sec.Pr.	42.1	49.1	38.6	48.2	32.5	29.8	9.1	42.9	23.8	10.7	37.9
- S.O.Ac.	31.8	37.4	27.9	37.6	24.1	22.1	9.1	34.2	12.5	3.6	28.2
- S.O.Bu.	19.7	25.4	16.2	19.1	13.3	9.2	13.6	19.6	8.3	3.6	16.7
d) Defined by Employer											
- El.Pr.	23.8	14.9	23.9	22.7	26.9	18.3	36.4	21.0	19.6	17.9	22.4
- Sec.Pr.	23.1	15.8	21.0	24.1	22.8	22.1	36.4	21.0	18.5	17.9	21.2
- S.O.Ac.	21.5	17.0	19.9	24.1	24.8	23.7	31.8	20.5	17.9	28.6	21.6
- S.O.Bu.	27.2	22.2	22.4	27.7	30.7	26.7	40.9	22.4	17.9	35.7	26.0
e) Defined by Faculties											
- El.Pr.	13.1	8.2	11.4	7.8	14.2	17.6	9.1	12.3	17.9	7.1	12.6
- Sec.Pr.	12.8	9.4	11.4	9.9	12.9	17.6	9.1	12.8	17.3	7.1	12.5
- S.O.Ac.	12.1	5.8	10.3	6.4	12.0	12.2	9.1	11.4	11.9	3.6	10.4
- S.O.Bu.	8.5	4.1	5.1	4.3	6.8	7.6	4.5	6.8	8.9	3.6	6.5
f) Defined by Prof. organizations											
- El.Pr.	37.2	31.9	41.9	36.9	39.8	30.5	9.1	37.4	39.3	21.4	37.0
- Sec.Pr.	35.6	33.3	37.1	39.0	34.6	37.4	9.1	37.4	39.9	21.4	35.6
- S.O.Ac.	32.8	27.8	33.5	34.8	32.2	34.4	31.8	36.1	53.6	39.3	34.1
- S.O.Bu.	30.5	28.1	27.2	32.6	26.1	35.1	36.4	31.1	45.2	53.6	30.4

APPENDIX I: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -- RESPONSES BY CLIENT GROUP

Question D: Elements of a Training Program

D TRAINING PROGRAM ELEMENTS	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
a) Common Skills											
- El.Pr.	90/9/1	85/9/2	92/5/2	77/9/2	91/7/1	66/10/1	73/18/0	85/9/2	82/11/1	75/7/4	86/8/2
- Sec.Pr.	86/8/1	87/10/2	87/4/2	84/11/3	80/5/1	79/12/2	73/18/0	85/9/2	82/12/1	71/7/4	83/8/2
- S.O.Ac.	87/6/2	85/8/3	86/6/2	80/7/4	80/4/1	73/11/1	64/18/5	83/9/2	87/7/1	82/4/4	83/6/2
- S.O.Bu.	69/15/5	66/16/8	66/17/6	62/17/7	63/12/5	46/19/2	55/18/0	64/16/6	66/21/4	82/11/4	64/15/5
b) Conceptual Skills											
- El.Pr.	41/46/8	49/43/9	47/35/8	41/37/6	45/37/7	34/30/4	46/27/9	47/37/7	45/33/6	18/57/7	43/39/8
- Sec.Pr.	40/44/8	40/45/9	45/32/7	43/40/7	41/31/6	39/38/5	46/23/14	48/36/7	45/33/7	18/57/4	42/37/7
- S.O.Ac.	51/33/7	52/30/7	56/24/7	52/31/5	48/25/5	44/26/5	46/23/14	56/27/6	56/26/4	54/32/0	51/28/6
- S.O.Bu.	41/31/12	39/31/15	41/25/14	34/33/14	34/25/13	28/24/8	23/23/23	43/27/11	36/32/10	57/32/4	37/28/12
c) Current Developmt Skills											
- El.Pr.	59/34/5	49/39/8	60/29/8	50/33/5	52/35/8	37/30/8	50/23/9	53/32/8	55/35/5	39/39/4	53/34/7
- Sec.Pr.	56/31/8	47/43/9	51/32/8	48/40/8	42/32/10	36/42/12	50/27/9	48/35/10	45/43/5	39/36/4	47/36/9
- S.O.Ac.	59/26/8	50/34/10	59/24/8	47/29/13	52/22/9	41/28/10	55/18/9	51/30/10	51/35/7	43/29/11	52/27/9
- S.O.Bu.	18/17/49	9/21/53	13/10/57	6/11/58	10/10/51	4/5/47	14/14/36	11/11/53	7/7/57	7/0/71	11/12/52
d) Decision-Making											
- El.Pr.	88/11/1	85/9/1	86/10/2	76/11/1	87/9/2	63/12/2	50/32/0	80/11/2	74/16/1	57/25/4	82/11/2
- Sec.Pr.	84/11/1	88/9/1	82/8/2	84/11/1	77/7/1	81/12/3	55/21/0	83/9/2	75/15/1	57/21/4	81/10/4
- S.O.Ac.	86/18/1	85/16/2	85/5/2	83/5/2	77/6/2	70/8/2	59/36/0	84/6/3	85/9/1	82/0/4	82/7/2
- S.O.Bu.	78/9/2	78/7/2	78/7/3	75/5/4	67/9/2	56/8/2	55/32/0	75/8/2	69/14/4	89/7/4	73/9/2
e) Educational Finance											
- El.Pr.	27/51/34	11/47/35	6/49/42	5/46/33	5/42/45	4/31/37	9/32/32	8/48/35	4/33/50	7/18/61	7/44/40
- Sec.Pr.	13/51/29	14/47/35	7/47/36	6/56/31	6/41/35	7/35/46	9/41/27	10/50/32	5/35/47	7/18/54	9/45/35
- S.O.Ac.	35/41/16	36/40/16	34/46/13	36/43/11	34/40/9	25/42/8	23/32/23	32/41/17	24/52/14	14/54/14	33/42/13
- S.O.Bu.	74/10/5	74/9/5	77/9/4	77/4/6	74/5/3	63/5/3	50/23/9	72/9/7	80/5/6	82/7/7	74/7/5
f) Evaluation (Personnel)											
- El.Pr.	75/23/1	77/18/1	83/12/2	74/11/2	78/17/1	57/12/0	55/9/0	72/16/2	66/19/1	61/18/4	75/17/1
- Sec.Pr.	72/22/2	78/18/1	78/13/1	79/12/3	69/14/1	73/15/2	59/5/0	73/16/2	66/19/1	57/18/4	73/16/2
- S.O.Ac.	71/19/3	75/17/3	78/13/2	74/13/2	68/12/2	61/12/2	55/5/5	70/17/3	71/14/2	71/7/4	71/15/2
- S.O.Bu.	34/20/31	38/18/31	35/16/34	28/18/35	26/20/29	18/14/28	23/9/23	29/26/25	33/23/23	57/25/7	31/19/29

Cont'd D Training Prog. Elemnts	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
g) Evaluation (Program											
- El.Pr.	74/24/2	66/27/2	77/17/3	69/16/2	70/23/2	53/14/2	27/18/0	67/22/2	64/18/2	54/21/4	68/22/2
- Sec Pr.	68/25/2	66/29/2	71/18/3	68/22/2	61/20/2	57/23/3	27/18/0	66/23/2	61/20/2	54/18/4	64/23/2
- S.O.Ac.	78/17/3	72/17/4	75/14/4	67/17/4	62/16/3	50/18/3	32/9/0	67/20/3	71/13/1	61/14/4	67/16/3
- S.O.Bu.	26/20/38	25/20/39	22/20/43	13/15/51	12/17/42	9/8/38	5/9/27	16/18/43	12/16/45	4/7/68	18/17/42
h) Human Relation Skills											
- El.Pr.	90/9/0	83/11/1	87/10/2	78/9/1	86/10/2	60/13/1	64/27/0	85/7/1	77/14/1	82/0/4	84/10/1
- Sec.Pr.	87/9/3	85/12/1	82/9/1	86/10/1	76/8/1	80/10/2	64/27/0	86/7/1	76/14/1	79/0/4	81/10/1
- S.O.Ac.	82/10/2	77/16/1	79/13/2	78/10/1	75/8/1	69/10/1	55/32/0	83/9/1	81/11/2	82/0/4	78/11/1
- S.O.Bu.	60/18/10	55/24/9	56/24/7	49/24/10	51/20/7	40/24/3	36/36/0	57/20/8	58/21/8	82/7/4	54/21/8
i) Knowledge Curr. (Content)											
- El.Pr.	52/35/11	47/35/13	52/36/10	43/33/9	48/41/8	31/33/8	46/41/0	47/33/14	53/30/10	57/21/4	48/36/10
- Sec.Pr.	48/35/12	39/41/18	44/35/12	32/46/16	39/36/9	26/42/22	36/41/5	40/36/19	45/35/1	57/18/4	40/37/14
- S.O.Ac.	47/32/14	37/36/19	46/33/13	37/33/19	39/32/11	26/37/15	32/32/9	43/31/19	36/39/15	54/21/7	40/33/15
- S.O.Bu.	11/22/50	8/17/59	6/18/59	1/11/68	4/14/54	3/5/50	9/14/41	5/14/59	4/9/66	4/0/79	6/15/57
j) Knowledge Educatnal Systems											
- El.Pr.	25/48/25	26/51/18	22/52/23	17/49/19	20/47/29	17/33/21	18/50/9	22/50/20	21/39/28	7/57/18	21/47/24
- Sec.Pr.	25/47/23	26/53/18	21/51/20	20/54/19	19/11/21	22/40/29	18/50/9	23/48/20	21/41/27	7/57/18	22/47/21
- S.O.Ac.	59/29/8	59/30/5	60/26/7	56/26/7	52/24/7	40/30/8	41/32/5	52/32/8	52/29/10	54/29/4	54/27/7
- S.O.Bu.	39/27/21	47/25/15	46/27/14	42/27/14	33/24/19	27/20/18	36/27/9	35/31/16	31/28/24	25/46/18	38/26/18
k) Educational Theory/ Philosophy											
- El.Pr.	38/45/14	35/47/14	38/48/12	40/39/6	40/46/10	28/37/6	32/41/9	45/37/10	45/38/8	29/46/11	39/44/11
- Sec.Pr.	37/43/14	35/47/15	35/45/11	42/44/9	37/39/8	35/47/8	36/41/9	45/38/10	45/39/7	25/46/7	38/43/11
- S.O.Ac.	59/29/7	47/36/10	55/28/9	56/29/4	52/25/24	41/35/2	46/27/14	57/28/6	62/25/5	50/29/4	53/29/7
- S.O.Bu.	17/30/39	17/33/36	18/28/40	16/31/35	11/25/40	10/28/26	23/23/27	12/32/37	14/29/37	11/36/39	14/29/38
l) Educational Methods Issues											
- El.Pr.	58/37/4	50/41/4	57/36/4	55/28/2	52/39/5	44/25/4	32/50/0	53/36/3	53/31/6	61/21/4	53/36/4
- Sec.Pr.	55/35/5	52/42/4	56/32/4	58/33/3	48/33/3	52/32/5	32/50/0	50/39/3	53/31/7	57/18/4	52/35/4
- S.O.Ac.	65/25/2	62/28/3	67/22/3	63/20/5	58/23/3	53/24/2	41/36/5	64/23/3	67/20/5	57/21/4	62/24/3
- S.O.Bu.	27/33/27	29/34/24	25/29/31	19/27/36	14/30/31	13/24/24	14/36/23	17/38/27	16/24/41	11/43/36	20/31/29

...Cont'd D Training Prog. Elemnts	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
m) Educational Law											
- El.Pr.	52/34/5	56/33/5	53/40/4	44/38/4	39/47/10	31/30/12	23/36/23	47/39/7	32/45/13	18/50/18	46/40/8
- Sec.Pr.	58/34/4	59/33/4	52/36/4	50/42/2	39/39/6	38/41/12	27/36/14	50/37/6	33/44/13	18/46/14	47/37/6
- S.O.Ac.	78/12/3	75/15/4	80/10/2	73/14/4	68/13/2	59/15/2	55/32/0	71/18/4	71/16/5	54/25/7	72/14/3
- S.O.Bu.	56/18/13	59/20/9	57/19/9	61/14/10	51/18/9	46/14/8	41/32/0	61/17/8	50/29/8	46/25/21	55/19/9
n) Leadership											
- El.Pr.	94/5/1	87/7/2	90/9/1	78/7/1	90/7/1	70/5/0	64/18/5	87/5/1	85/7/1	70/14/4	87/7/1
- Sec.Pr	90/5/0	90/6/2	85/6/2	87/9/1	80/4/1	87/5/2	64/23/0	89/5/1	85/5/1	64/14/4	86/6/1
- S.O.Ac.	84/8/2	81/11/1	83/8/3	78/9/1	78/5/2	70/9/0	68/14/0	81/10/3	88/4/1	77/4/4	81/8/2
- S.O.Bu.	56/20/11	56/21/10	53/23/11	46/26/11	47/22/9	34/24/9	46/23/5	55/18/9	63/16/6	75/11/7	52/21/10
o) Man/Administration											
- El.Pr.	59/37/3	57/35/4	57/37/4	55/29/3	56/35/4	41/31/2	32/46/5	55/35/5	54/38/2	46/36/4	55/35/3
- Sec.Pr.	59/35/2	64/31/3	56/32/3	67/28/1	53/29/2	60/30/2	41/41/0	58/33/3	56/36/2	43/36/4	58/32/2
- S.O Ac.	68/24/1	66/23/4	67/22/3	66/20/4	63/18/2	51/26/2	64/23/5	70/19/4	70/24/0	64/14/7	65/21/2
- S.O.Bu.	74/11/2	73/13/4	73/12/2	75/9/1	65/11/2	57/9/2	68/14/15	78/9/2	71/17/2	79/18/4	71/12/3
p) Organizational Skills											
- El.Pr.	74/24/1	68/26/2	75/21/2	63/21/2	72/23/1	47/27/1	50/32/5	71/21/2	65/27/1	50/25/7	69/24/1
- Sec.Pr.	71/24/1	73/23/2	71/18/2	67/25/2	65/17/1	66/26/1	50/32/5	73/19/4	67/24/1	46/25/7	69/21/1
- S.O.Ac.	74/17/1	69/21/4	73/15/2	72/14/3	66/24/1	55/21/2	55/32/5	74/15/3	73/20/2	61/21/4	69/17/2
- S.O.Bu.	72/14/2	69/15/4	73/10/2	69/12/4	61/14/3	54/12/2	50/23/5	70/12/3	64/23/2	68/21/11	67/14/3
q) Political											
- El.Pr.	27/46/25	29/47/21	36/40/21	21/53/13	27/45/25	22/35/16	9/27/46	24/46/23	21/45/21	11/39/36	27/45/22
- Sec.Pr.	28/45/21	30/49/19	38/36/18	27/53/15	28/40/17	27/42/21	14/23/46	27/43/23	24/45/19	11/36/32	29/43/19
- S.O.Ac.	54/26/12	58/27/9	66/18/8	64/18/8	60/17/7	50/24/4	18/32/27	57/22/14	55/32/6	54/29/4	58/23/9
- S.O.Bu.	44/26/17	44/29/15	44/29/15	46/26/14	46/21/12	34/25/7	23/27/23	43/27/16	38/38/9	50/36/7	43/26/14
r) Professional Development											
- El.Pr.	55/38/6	45/41/9	46/45/6	43/36/7	45/42/8	34/33/5	27/27/27	51/37/5	44/38/7	18/54/7	46/40/7
- Sec.Pr.	53/36/6	46/42/9	46/40/7	40/45/9	42/36/5	41/42/7	27/27/27	49/37/7	44/37/1	18/54/7	45/38/7
- S.O.Ac.	56/32/5	44/37/11	46/36/6	45/36/9	49/27/6	40/30/7	41/18/23	51/32/8	57/25/8	25/54/7	49/32/7
- S.O.Bu.	23/30/32	19/30/37	18/28/39	16/27/38	16/26/33	12/18/31	18/23/27	21/31/31	19/30/32	7/71/14	18/28/34

APPENDIX J: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -- RESPONSES BY CLIENT GROUP

Question Ea): College of Teachers

E_1 COLLEGE OF TEACHERS	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
a) Should Be Established	82	88	85	89	83	83	72	82	64	55	82%
N =(	362	322	252	135	553	114	18	196	137	20	2109)
b) Designed By Ministry	70	70	66	74	66	70	33	68	64	60	68%
c) Designed By Federation	84	85	84	79	80	69	33	74	55	40	79%
d) Designed By Others	18	17	14	18	12	12	6	22	29	50	17%
e) Should Include:											
- El.T.	97	99	98	96	97	95	89	97	96	90	97%
- Sec.T.	97	99	98	98	96	97	94	99	96	90	97%
- Post.Dec.T.	69	54	62	46	61	43	61	61	63	50	59%
- Prog.Supp.	49	34	52	31	42	33	39	46	56	40	43%
- Dept.Head	82	90	87	88	80	84	50	84	80	65	83%
- Vice-Principals	85	89	93	90	84	82	50	83	71	65	85%
- Principals	92	93	95	96	94	91	61	90	80	65	92%
- Mun.S.O.	74	66	74	73	67	68	61	70	63	55	69%
- Mun.Dir's.	64	54	66	63	57	55	44	63	55	45	59%
- Prov.S.O.	62	61	66	64	59	62	44	66	61	45	62%
- DeputyMin.	51	43	51	52	47	40	28	49	45	50	47%

APPENDIX K: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -- RESPONSES BY CLIENT GROUP

Question Eb): Term Appointments

TERM APPOINTMENTS	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
a) Acceptable in Principle	93	90	87	86	82	86	94	85	87	68	8'
N =	(349	291	206	116	437	93	18	177	135	19	1841)
b) Should Apply To:											
- Prog.Supp.	68	54	74	56	68	51	56	64	67	53	64%
- Dept. Head	87	85	81	85	79	85	89	79	80	68	82%
- Vice-Principals	84	83	76	78	73	76	94	77	81	68	79%
- Principals	78	78	72	74	65	68	94	70	75	58	72%
- Mun.S.O.'s	75	78	77	78	67	79	94	66	73	74	73%
- Mun. Dir.'s	68	73	72	73	58	65	83	61	68	37	66%
- Prov. S.O.'s	71	72	73	80	67	72	89	64	69	63	70%
- Deputy Min.	62	58	65	65	55	55	72	55	58	37	59%

APPENDIX L: QUESTIONNAIRE ANALYSIS -- RESPONSES BY CLIENT GROUP

Question Ec): Legislation Re Duties

LEGISLATION RE DUTIES	T.El.	T.Sec	VP.El.	VP.Sec	P.El.	P.Sec	Trust.	Other	S.O.Ac	S.O.Bu	
a) Ministry Write											
- for Principals	72	84	74	82	78	89	68	73	84	61	78%
- for S.O.'s	81	87	84	84	84	85	68	83	86	68	84%
b) Boards Write											
- for Principals	59	50	59	43	52	39	59	49	51	50	52%
- for S.O.'s	52	43	49	37	48	41	68	43	49	54	47%

APPENDIX M: CONSULTATION/PRESENTATIONS RE TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION

DATE	MEETING
October 21, 1980	Northwestern Ontario Regional Education Council
November 21, 1980	Province of Ontario Education Officers
November 26, 1980	Dr. B. Shapiro, OISE
November 28, 1980	OSSTF Headmasters' Council
December 10, 1980	Metropolitan Toronto Directors of Education
December 15, 1980	Dr. G. Bordelau, University of Ottawa
December 16, 1980	M. Beauchemin, Ottawa Board of Education
December 16, 1980	P. Xatruch, Ottawa RCSS Board
December 17, 1980	K. Harris, President, Ontario Principal's Association
January 7, 1981	Cochrane-Iroquois Falls Administration, Principals
January 8, 1981	Kapuskasing Administration, Principals
January 9, 1981	Willis Glenn Re OASBO
January 12, 1981	Lincoln County Administration, Principals
January 12, 1981	Dr. Robert Knoop, Brock University
January 12, 1981	F. Zanutto, Niagara South
January 14, 1981	Durham Board of Education Administration, Principals
January 15, 1981	OTF Executive Council
January 20, 1981	Dr. L. Kurteweig, Lakehead University
January 21, 1981	Nipigon-Red Rock Administration, Principals
January 21, 1981	Nipigon-Red Rock Trustees
January 22, 1981	Lakehead Board of Education Principals, Administration, Trustees
January 27, 1981	R. G. Stoness, Halton Board of Education
January 28, 1981	Dr. A. Effrat, York University
January 29, 1981	Provincial Regional Directors
January 29, 1981	G. Seguin, OAEAO
January 29, 1981	Toronto Principal's Course Candidates, Part II
January 30, 1981	Chief Executive Officers' Conference
February 2, 1981	York Borough Administration, Principals
February 2, 1981	Metropolitan Toronto Elementary Principals
February 3, 1981	Dufferin-Peel RCSS Board Administration, Principals
February 4, 1981	Windsor-Essex Principals
February 5, 1981	Eastern Ontario Regional Education Council
February 9, 1981	Niagara South Administration
February 9, 1981	Niagara South Principals
February 10, 1981	Dr. D. Musella, OISE
February 11, 1981	Norfolk Board of Education Administration, Principals
February 12, 1981	OSSHC District 4 Executive
February 13, 1981	Timmins Board of Education Administration, Principals
February 16, 1981	Ottawa Board of Education Administration
February 16, 1981	Ottawa RCSS Board Administration
February 17, 1981	Ottawa RCSS Board English-Language Principals
February 17, 1981	Ottawa RCSS Board French-Language Principals
February 18, 1981	Middlesex Board of Education Administration, Principals
February 18, 1981	London Board of Education Administration
February 18, 1981	London-Middlesex RCSS Principals

DATE	MEETING
February 19, 1981	Metropolitan Toronto Psychologists
February 20, 1981	Perth County Board of Education Administration
February 23, 1981	Peel Board of Education Executive Council and Board Chairman
February 26, 1981	East Parry Sound Administration and Principals
February 27, 1981	Western Ontario Regional Education Council
March 2, 1981	Nipissing RCSS Board Administration
March 2, 1981	Nipissing Board of Education Administration, Principals
March 3, 1981	Peterborough Board of Education Administration, Principals
March 6, 1981	Victoria County Administration
March 7, 1981	D. Timmins, AOSBO
March 10, 1981	Hastings Board of Education Administration, Secondary Principals, Elementary Principals
March 11, 1981	Carleton Board of Education Administration, Elementary Principals
March 11, 1981	Carleton RCSS Board Chairman, Director
March 11, 1981	University of Ottawa Graduate Studies Committee
March 12, 1981	Renfrew Board of Education Administration, Principals
March 13, 1981	Dr. T. R. Williams, Queen's University
March 14, 1981	FWTAO Council of Presidents
March 16, 1981	Frontenac-Lennox and Addington RCSS Board Administration, Principals
March 17, 1981	Leeds-Grenville Public and Separate Administration, Principals
March 18, 1981	Stormont-Dundas and Glengarry Administration, Principals
March 19, 1981	Halton Principals/S.O. Candidates
March 20, 1981	POEOA Annual Meeting
March 29 - April 10, 1981	Various school systems in the United Kingdom
April 28, 1981	Fort Frances-Rainy River Administration, Principals
April 29, 1981	Dryden Board of Education Administration, Principals
April 30, 1981	Lakehead RCSS Board Administration, Principals
April 30, 1981	Lakehead Board of Education Federation Representatives
May 1, 1981	Kapuskasing Administration, Principals
May 4, 1981	Windsor Elementary Principals
May 7, 1981	OPSMTF Executive
May 11, 1981	Elgin County Elementary Principals
May 26, 1981	Prescott-Russell Administration, Principals
May 27, 1981	OASBO Annual Conference
June 8, 1981	Dufferin County Elementary Principals
June 10, 1981	Toronto Board of Education Administration, Principals, Trustees
June 11, 1981	Northeastern Ontario Regional Education Council
June 18, 1981	Durham RCSS Board Administration, Principals
June 24, 1981	Dean and staff of Ottawa Faculty of Education
July 7, 1981	London Principal's Course
July 8, 1981	Waterloo Principal's Course
July 9, 1981	Guelph Principal's Course
July 14, 1981	Sudbury Principal's Course
July 16, 1981	Thunder Bay Principal's Course
July 21, 1981	Hamilton Principal's Course
July 22, 1981	St. Catharines Principal's Course
July 27, 1981	Peterborough Principal's Course

DATE	MEETING
July 28, 1981	Ottawa Principal's Course
July 29, 1981	Kingston Principal's Course
August 31, 1981	Summer Course Principals
September 9, 1981	Dr. Leithwood, Dr. Scott, OISE
September 10, 1981	OCSOA Executive
September 11, 1981	North York Professional Development Committee
September 14, 1981	Central Ontario Regional Management Committee
September 15, 1981	Midnorthern Regional Education Council
September 17, 1981	Eastern Ontario Regional Education Council
September 30, 1981	Eastern Ontario Curriculum Council
October 1, 1981	Northwestern Ontario Regional Education Council
October 3, 1981	AEFO Executive (Principals) Council
October 7, 1981	Central Ontario Regional Education Council (western area)
October 8, 1981	Northeastern Regional Education Council
October 8, 1981	OSSTF Headmasters' Council Executive
October 9, 1981	Western Ontario Regional Education Council
October 14, 1981	ASFO Executive
October 15, 1981	Bruce-Grey RCSS Board Administration, Principals
October 20, 1981	Midnorthern Regional Education Council
October 21, 1981	East York Administration, Principals
October 29, 1981	Central Ontario Regional Education Council
November 3, 1981	Graduate class, Queen's University
November 4, 1981	Eastern Regional Principal's Course Liaison Council
December 8, 1981	Branch Directors, Curriculum Division
December 9, 1981	OTF Executive
December 10, 1981	Supervisory Officer Study Group, Oakville
February 8, 1982	Etobicoke Administrative Council
February 17, 1982	Prescott-Russell RCSS Administration, Principals
February 18, 1982	Northumberland/Newcastle Administration, Principals
February 19, 1982	Central Region Principal's Course Liaison Council
March 10, 1982	Assistant Director, OISE
March 17, 1982	POEOA Annual Meeting
March 29, 1982	Toronto Administrative Council
March 31, 1982	Eastern Ontario Principal's Course Liaison Council
April 1, 1982	Nipigon-Red Rock Administration, Principals
April 7, 1982	Metropolitan Toronto Directors
April 15, 1982	ASFO Executive
April 15, 1982	OAEAO Board of Directors
April 16, 1982	Northeastern Ontario Region Staff
April 19, 1982	Midnorthern Principal's Course (French) Liaison Council
April 22, 1982	Ministry of Education Regional Business Superintendents
April 23, 1982	OASBO Board of Directors
April 23, 1982	OAEAO Area 2 Members
April 29, 1982	Faculty of Education Representatives, Queen's University
May 3, 1982	Principal's Course Candidates
May 4, 1982	OISE Assistant Director and Faculty Representatives
May 5, 1982	OASBO Annual Conference

DATE	MEETING
May 6, 1982	Scarborough Elementary Principals
May 7, 1982	OAEAO Education Committee
May 11, 1982	Timmins RCSS Board
May 13, 1982	ALSBO Executive
May 25, 1982	OTF Executive
May 26, 1982	Study Group-Administration, Principals
May 27, 1982	Metropolitan Toronto Psychologists, Researchers, Social Workers
May 28, 1982	OSSTF Headmasters' Council
June 2, 1982	Northeastern Regional Education Council
June 3, 1982	OAEAO Area 3 Members
June 3, 1982	Principal's Group, Peel
June 9, 1982	Sudbury RCSS Board Administration, Principals
June 10, 1982	Teacher Education Branch Staff
June 11, 1982	AEFO Executive
June 17, 1982	Midnorthern Regional Education Council
June 23, 1982	Council of Deans, Faculties of Education
June 25, 1982	OCSOA Board of Directors
July 16, 1982	Waterloo Principal's Course
July 19, 1982	Sudbury Principal's Course
July 19, 1982	North Bay Principal's Course
July 20, 1982	St. Catharine's Principal's Course
July 22, 1982	London Principal's Course
July 23, 1982	Kingston Principal's Course
July 26, 1982	Ottawa Principal's Course
July 27, 1982	Thunder Bay Principal's Course
July 29, 1982	Toronto Principal's Course

APPENDIX N: SOURCES OF BRIEFS AND RECOMMENDATIONS SUBMITTED

Acknowledgement is made here of the contributions the following associations and individuals made to the study and from whom relevant correspondence and/or briefs were received.

Associations

Association of Educational Researchers of Ontario
Association of Large School Boards of Ontario
Association des surintendants franco-ontariens
Association des enseignants franco-ontariens
Bruce Grey RCSS Principals' Association
Carleton Principals' Association
Cochrane-Irequois Falls Advisory Committee for the Trainable Mentally Retarded
Directeurs d'écoles séparées catholique du district de Hearst
East York Principals' Association
Etobicoke Public School Principals' Association
Federation of Women Teachers' Association of Ontario
Hastings County Elementary Principals' Association
Lakehead Catholic School Principals' Association
Lambton County Roman Catholic Separate School Board
London Public School Principals' Association
Metropolitan Toronto Psychological Services Committee
Ontario Secondary School Headmasters' Council
Ontario Association of Education Administrative Officials
Ontario Association of School Business Officials
Ontario Catholic Secondary School Principals' Association
Ontario Catholic Supervisory Officers' Association
Ontario Municipal and Provincial Education Officers' Association
Ontario Principals' Association
Ontario Provincial Federation, Council for Exceptional Children
Ontario Public School Men Teachers' Federation
Ontario Separate School Business Officials' Association
Ontario Teachers' Federation
Personnel and Organization Committee, Toronto Board of Education
Psychologists, Social Workers and Educational Research Officers in Metropolitan Toronto
Scarborough Secondary School Principals' Association
Scarborough Supervisory Officers
Secondary School Headmasters, York County
Staff, Principal's Course, London, 1981
Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry County Roman Catholic Separate School Board
Toronto Public School Principals' Association
Toronto Secondary School Principals' Association
University of Ottawa, Faculty of Education
Waterloo Principal's Course, 1981

Individuals

R. J. Andrews
J. Armaly
A. Berga
S. Bezaire
R. Bilyk
J. G. Bishop
L. A. Bradley
H. D. Branscombe
D. G. Brent
B. G. Bromwich
P. A. Burns
J. D. Cadwell
J. Chiarelli
C. J. M. Dawson
A. Dekker
J. L. Diamond
N. Dodgson
D. S. Dool
B. Drechsel
D. M. Euale
S. S. Euler
D. Field
J. F. Freudeman
J. R. Gall
B. E. Giles
D. Goldman
J. K. Graham
P. Gryseels
R. M. Hall
J. R. Hardy
N. J. Hartmann
D. P. Hicks
L. A. Hutchinson
O. A. Jackson
G. Jenkins
J. E. Kabayama
R. A. Killam
A. Kingstone
R. Knoop
L. L. Korteweg
E. J. Lagroix
R. A. Leblanc
K. I. Lee
J. A. Leeds
J. A. Leroux
A. McKenzie
G. R. McConnell
D. McCullogh
P. McNeice
E. J. Mills
R. B. Moase
J. F. Moher
G. R. Morrissey
W. J. Mowat
R. Muir
D. Murray
G. S. O'Brien
S. O'Brien
E. O'Connor
M. O'Connor
J. I. Paquette
D. C. Parrott
L. Poirier
J. J. Prince
B. Protheroe
T. Reilly
K. R. Richmond
K. W. Ridge
E. A. Rix
G. Samuelson
T. Schonberg
M. S. Shannon
H. Shantz
M. Sheehan
D. Shewburg
R. Smith
F. J. Soplet
R. B. St. John
W. Thiessen
W. Thomas
G. Thompson
F. S. Toll
B. Trueman
J. M. A. Turner
R. J. Turner
L. Vandenbosch
J. Villeneuve
L. Waldock
B. R. Walker
J. S. Waters

M. E. K. Lydon
J. H. MacDonald
J. Mantle
R. Matsushita
W. McKelvey
M. E. Watson
R. K. Wilson
D. C. Woodrow
J. Young